This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Per. 1419 e. 402
S Th. per 2



THE

CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW

FOR

APRIL 1883 : JULY 1883

VOLUME XVI.



LONDON
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
SPOTTISWOODE & CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE, E.C.
1883

Per. 1L19. e. 202
16.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
PALGRAVE'S 'VISIONS OF ENGLAND'	1
LANGEN'S HISTORY OF THE ROMAN CHURCH	11
FOLK-TALES	31
DR. FARRAR'S 'EARLY DAYS OF CHRISTIANITY'	47
THE CLAIMS OF AUTHORITY IN MATTERS OF FAITH	71
BISHOP THIRLWALL	95
CLERGY PENSIONS	130
THE INCREASE OF THE EPISCOPATE	153
LATTER YEARS OF BISHOP WILBERFORCE	185
DEPRIVATION AS A PENALTY FOR CONTEMPT OF COURT IN ECCLESIASTICAL CASES	203
ON THE USE OF UNFERMENTED WINE IN THE HOLY COMMUNION	210
CHURCH ORGANIZATION IN THE ROYAL NAVY	257
THE LEGAL AND HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE STUDY OF THE CANON LAW	270
OUR LORD'S HUMAN EXAMPLE	282
PIERRE FRANÇOIS LE COURAYER	313
THE WORK OF THE LONDON LAY HELPERS' ASSOCIATION	332
EVOLUTION, ETHICS AND RELIGION	346
GWATKIN'S STUDIES OF ARIANISM	375
THE NOMENCLATURE OF ENGLISH DISSENT	402
THE CATHOLIC SIDE OF ANGLICANISM	420
M. RENAN'S SOUVENIRS	444
OUR DUTY ON THE MARRIAGE QUESTION	463
SHORT NOTICES	228, 466
INDEX	503

THE

CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Nº XXXI. *APRIL* 1883.

ART. I.—PALGRAVE'S 'VISIONS OF ENGLAND.'

The Visions of England. By FRANCIS T. PALGRAVE, M.A. (London, 1881.)

THIS book will have been already in the hands of many of our readers. In an excellently written preface Mr. Palgrave describes it as 'an attempt to offer, not poems on every critical moment or conspicuous man in our long annals, but single lyrical pictures of such leading or typical characters in English history, and only such, as have seemed to him amenable to a strictly poetical treatment.' Those who know anything of his father's writings will appreciate the touching utterance of a 'hope that the love of truth and the love of England are his by inheritance, in a degree sufficient to exempt this book (the labour of several years) from infidelity to either.' Patriotism of a refined and truly moral type is indeed apparent whenever Mr. Palgrave speaks of the 'dear land where new is one with old,' 'land of the most law-loving, the most free;' and there is very much in this book which will go straight home to any heart that is at once English and Christian. We must confess that, in our opinion, there would have been still more if the accomplished author (who condemns the modern hexameter as unsatisfactory) had been more sparing in the employment of unfamiliar, or in some cases eccentric, metrical systems, within which—we must add, not within which alone—occur repeatedly lines so unrhythmical as to irritate the reader's ear, constructions so involved as to draw his attention to their grammar, and such a jerk and strain in the expression of 'the passion of the moment' as rather to chill than to stimulate his sympathy. Cases of this sort occur in 'Crossing Solway,'

'The Return of Law,' 'Whitehall Gallery,' 'A Dirge of Repentance,' and 'Trafalgar.' Be the theme never so inspiriting, poetry trammelled by such conditions cannot stir the blood or grasp the memory like 'The Spanish Armada,' or 'The Battle of Naseby,' or 'Bonnie Dundee,' or 'The Gathering of the Clans' in *Waverley*, or 'The Battle of the Baltic.' Here and there, too, in the book there are quaint terms, such as 'feral' for funereal (p. 302) and the 'riverain mead' (p. 71). Milton's classicalisms in 'Lycidas' do not reconcile us to such an apostrophe to England as—

> 'O land whom the *gods*, loving most, most sorely in wisdom have tried' (p. 202);

and there seems to be some confusion in such a phrase as—

> 'Baptized with the *chrisom* of gore' (p. 204).

On the other hand, not only is page after page rich in bits of true jewellery—delicate touches, sometimes Tennysonian in their finished grace—such as those which show us Raleigh's vessel floating

> 'Up wide Amana, islanded with palms
> Twinned in their beauty on the mirroring calms' (p. 145),

or the

> 'Waft of pearly haze'

which

> 'Lies on the sapphire field of air
> So radiant and so still,'

or the smoke

> 'Floating in white repose
> O'er the grey peace of cottage-walls half seen' (p. 314),

or the valley which—

> 'With all its wealth outspread of harvest hopes,
> Half green, half russet gold, runs up
> In a fair tapestry shaken o'er the slopes' (p. 327).

Not only do we meet with felicitous epithets illuminating a whole idea, such as 'the small *parochial* world of sight and touch' (p. 53); not only are some of the poems fraught with meditative force and depth, and ennobled by a loyalty to right even when wrong may seem to have conquered; but the readers of certain charming 'Hymns' published fourteen years ago, especially of 'The Day-star,' 'Lost and Found,' and 'The King's Messenger,' will find their charm reproduced in the simplicity of 'Paulinus and Edwin' (the scene at Godmundingham), 'The Captive Child' (Princess Elizabeth Stuart, whose

dreary death-room is one of the sights of Carisbrook Castle), 'The Childless Mother' (Anne after the death of the Duke of Gloucester), and, above all, in the following lines, which conclude the poem on the 'The Battle of Towton Field,' fought on a Palm Sunday:—

> 'Love, o'er palms in triumph strown,
> Passing, through the crowd alone—
> Silent mid the exulting cry,—
> To Jerusalem to die:
> Thou, foreknowing all, didst know
> How Thy blood in vain would flow,
> How our madness oft would prove
> Recreant to the law of love;
> Wrongs that men from men endure
> Doing Thee to death once more:'

verses of such a character that we hardly complain of the imperfect rhyme in the last couplet.

Mr. Palgrave's 'Visions' begin early enough, with the tin trade, of which, in far distant ages, Belerium, or the Land's End, was the mart. Anyone who has seen that weird spot will recognize the truth of the description. We cannot say that we care much for 'The Dream of Maxen Wledig,' the usurping Emperor Maximus. Mr. Freeman, perhaps, would hardly admit its right to a place in such a series; but his enthusiasm for the prince with whose name 'there is no other in history to compare'[1] would be satisfied by the tribute to our great Alfred—

> 'O much vex'd life, for us too short, too dear!
> The laggard body lame behind the soul;
> Pain, that ne'er marr'd the mind's serene control;
> Breathing on earth heaven's æther atmosphere,
> God with thee, and the love that casts out fear,' &c.

Anyone who has gazed on that broad stone in the cloisters of Westminster which professes to cover the remains of monastic victims of the Black Death will read with special interest the wailing lines which represent the horror and anguish of English folk in 1348–9, when 'the swift soft stroke of the air' laid low such thousands. In this poem 'the glory of song blazing out from the choir' sounds like an echo of Keble's 'Christmas-day.' The utter lack of moral interest in the Wars of the Roses is brought home to us in the poem on Towton Field; but we must remark that 'the monks' could not look out from York Minster on that scene of conflict, for

[1] *Hist. Norm. Conq.* i. 49.

the metropolitan church of the north was all along a home of secular canons. Monasticism is kindly dealt with, as offering a 'haven' to weak hearts. The Middle Ages are set before us as a time of

> 'Extremes and contrasts, where the good
> Was more than human in its tenderness
> Of chivalry. . . .
> And evil raging with a wild excess
> Of more than brutal,' &c. (p. 99).

One of the most interesting features of the book is the protest which it repeatedly makes against 'opinions current during the last fifty years' (Preface, p. xiv), not only as to the events of the seventeenth century, particularly referred to in that passage, but as to those of the Tudor period. The typical member of that 'hard-hearted' dynasty[1] stands out again as a self-willed and blood-stained tyrant, 'the royal robber,' the man of 'insatiate lust,' of 'brutal, selfish sway;' and Mr. J. A. Froude's *Cultus Henrici Octavi* is about as severely handled in verse as formerly by Mr. Goldwin Smith in prose:—

> 'With casuist sneer o'erglossing works of blood,
> Miscalling evil good;
> Before some despot-hero falsely named
> Grovelling in shameful worship unashamed' (p. 110).

We cannot refrain from quoting the next lines, which seem to us, on the whole, the noblest in the book. It should perhaps be explained that the poem is on the murder of Sir Thomas More:—

> 'But they of the great race
> Look equably, not caring much, on foe
> And fame and misesteem of man below;
> And with forgiving radiance on their face,
> And eyes that aim beyond the bourne of space,
> Seeing the invisible, glory-clad, go up,
> And drink the absinthine cup,
> Fill'd nectar-deep by the dear love of Him
> Slain at Jerusalem
> To free them from a tyrant worse than this,
> Changing brief anguish for the heart of bliss.'

For another exquisite passage on 'the exaltation of the humble,' on those children of light who 'conquer in their fall,' and win hearts from their apparent ruin, we must refer to a poem on Falkland's grave (p. 175).

[1] So once named, in the writer's hearing, by the late Dean Stanley.

Mr. Palgrave's view of Mary Stuart is indicated in the lines called 'Crossing Solway.' He does not, in the now reigning fashion, treat her as certainly guilty; but neither does he seem able to follow Mr. Hosack in asserting her entire innocence. In one stanza he speaks of her as 'seduced by men of blood, in her passionate mood, by crime to avenge her on crime,' *i.e.* to take Darnley's life in revenge for Rizzio's. Yet he adds—

> 'Was she guilty? Who knows? for the craft of her foes
> Stamps her with the shame of the night;'

as if the 'Glasgow letter' found in the fateful casket, beginning, 'Being gone from the place where I had left my heart,' and characterized, as Mr. Hosack says,[1] by a brutality and depravity which exceed the most revolting pictures 'in the realm of fiction,' were a forgery dictated by deadly hate. But he assumes the reality of her 'fiery love' for Bothwell, and hints at a peculiar explanation of it, which, however, would seem to require that this 'love' should not begin earlier than April 24, 1567, when she was taken by Bothwell to Dunbar, and should end before her marriage on May 15, when she told the French ambassador that she 'never could be happy, wishing only for death.' On this showing, the three letters alleged 'to have been written' by her to Bothwell from Stirling, *before* he met and took her to Dunbar, must also be set aside as spurious. In the poem before us Mr. Palgrave repeatedly speaks of Mary as a 'girl' in 1567–8; but she was born in December of 1542, and had seen only too much of life in the years between her French marriage and the tragical close of her actual reign. Scott, in *The Abbot*, calls her 'a grown dame' at Lochleven. On the question whether she was actually a party to Babington's regicidal plot Mr. Palgrave says that, be her part in those 'crimes' what it might—

> 'On her head
> Least stains of gore-guiltiness lie;'

but his allusion to Burghley and Walsingham, as having, by their inhuman craft, 'tempted her astray' to her destruction, may imply that he regards the alleged letter to Babington as genuine, even in those passages which contemplated the murder of Elizabeth. Mr. Palgrave is for once inaccurate as to a detail: Morton did not enter Mary's room with Darnley and Ruthven on the night of Rizzio's murder.

[1] *Mary, Queen of Scots, and her Accusers*, i. 198. He dwells also on its internal inconsistencies.

'Elizabeth at Tilbury' does not please us: it is blusterous and unmusical. We pass by the lines which dwell on Raleigh, on Sidney, on Herbert, on Charles I.'s third daughter, Anne (who died repeating Psalm xiii. 3), on Hampden, and on Strafford—only remarking that Mr. Palgrave calls Strafford a hero dying for order, as Hampden for freedom—each 'seeing and taking for all his side of England's shield' (p. 169). While he abhors the 'sullen' fanaticism of Puritanism, he owns 'the one great blot' in Charles I.'s character, and also his incapacity to see that the age of Tudor government was past. But what of Cromwell? The pains which Mr. Palgrave has bestowed on this, the most massive and imperial figure on the great Civil War stage, suggest to his readers a view of that 'soaring, enormous, labyrinthine soul' which 'differs widely,' as he tells us in a note (p. 177), from that presented by Carlyle, whom indeed he alludes to as a worshipper of 'power for power's own sake,' an idolatry against which, in these pages, he repeatedly and energetically protests. He recognizes him (who would not?) as 'great,' yet adds, 'with an earth-born greatness, untempered, untuned;' 'least willing of despots,' 'despot despite himself;' 'not bloodthirsty by birth,' but deeming blood for certain purposes 'just liquor 'twas needful to pour'—as in Ireland. Cromwell, in his eyes, is 'a hero warped and scarred by guile and coarseness,' wishing to govern by law, yet 'goaded by fate on that iron-tracked path he has framed;' wishing to be loved, and wondering 'to the close why he cannot win hearts.' And as to his sincerity? Mr. Palgrave in his appendix partly quotes, and in his verses substantially embodies, the view of 'a singularly acute and weighty analyst of character,' Dr. Mozley, who, in his essay on Cromwell (an article in the *Christian Remembrancer* for April 1846[1]), described him as keeping a conscience which was amenable to his ambition, a sense of religious obligation which did not 'chasten or correct his motives, which not only let him do what he liked, but urged him vehemently to do it.' But it is surely unfair to call the great Protector a Cæsar Attila (p. 231); and Mr. Palgrave in an earlier passage had almost absolved him for the sake of his 'passionate love' of England. In the notes and appendix, which should be carefully compared with the text, 'the terrorism of Cromwell's government, and the almost universal hatred which it inspired' (p. 178), 'the ever-increasing unsuccess of his career' (p. 345), and the indelible impression made on the

[1] Mozley's *Essays*, i. 317.

Irish mind by the 'savage rule' of the man who then concentrated the force of English Protestantism (p. 348), are set forth with a plainness which may be at once startling and healthful for those whose ideas have been formed since Hallam's influence began to wane. It is to Hallam's judgments that Mr. Palgrave repeatedly refers, as to those of 'the one man of even weight and balance' among the historians of this great era, except, perhaps, as he says in one place, in regard to Strafford. It is the fashion to abuse the Restoration: but Mr. Palgrave celebrates it as 'The Return of Law,' quoting in one of his notes a weighty sentence from Professor Seeley to that effect. He does not profess to share Macaulay's enthusiasm for William of Orange; and, while owning his greatness, dwells on the coldness which kept him alone 'in glacier isolation,' and made him 'unjust to his better self' in the violation of the Limerick 'pledges.' Just now, perhaps, it will be difficult to assimilate Mr. Palgrave's keen sense of England's misdoing towards Ireland as expressed in the verses called 'A Dirge of Repentance.' Yet amid the indignation, almost the despair, which Irish crime has lately produced in English hearts, it is a duty to forget neither the barbarities of the Elizabethan campaigns in Ireland, of Coote and his fellows in 1641, of the Cromwellians at Drogheda and Wexford, nor the protracted and elaborate tyrannies of the post-Revolution penal code. The Celtic race has a long memory; and there are things which it has not as yet had time to forget.

We must pass lightly over the remaining historical 'Visions.' The best of them, to our mind, are those on Johnson and Washington. Of the former Macaulay remarks in a well-known passage that he is 'more intimately known to posterity than other men are to their contemporaries;' and Mr. Palgrave similarly exclaims—

> 'Strange fate that bids thee thus, o'er all
> The millions veil'd beyond recall,
> Amongst us yet in living presence stand!' (p. 257).

The great American hero is celebrated as

> 'In self-effacement great,
> Magnanimous to endure and wait . . .
> Master of fate through self-control
> And utter stainlessness of soul' (p. 306).

These are but a few of the grand lines devoted to the memory of him whom America acknowledges, in the inscription on his statue in front of the Capitol at Washington, as

'first in war, first in peace, first in the love of his countrymen:' of whom Mr. Ludlow says in his excellent little *History of the War of American Independence*, that 'no more typical Englishman ever lived.'

We can notice but one more poem: it is that which is headed 'Things Visible and Invisible.' The readers of Mr. Palgrave's hymns will remember two sets of verses on 'Faith and Sight in the Latter Days' and 'The Reign of Law.' The poem before us is as it were a development of these. It begins by picturing the imperious pressure of visible and material life, tending to crowd out faith in the invisible: and the difficulty of associating any real and present interests with the events of a life spent in Palestine 'so long ago, so long.' As the poet said in his earlier book—

> 'Dim tracts of time divide
> Those golden days from me;
> Thy voice comes strange o'er years of change:
> How can I follow Thee?
> Comes faint and far Thy voice,
> From vales of Galilee . . . .
> Thou art a star, far off, too far,
> Too far to follow Thee?'

so now he contrasts

> 'The world devouring with impassioned stride
> Its history . . . .
> The dazzling Present with his glory-show.'

with

> 'That scarce visible life in Syrian land,
> Lost and time-buried by the Dead Sea strand' (p. 320).

So it is: to many minds which have not by any means formally parted with their faith this warfare of sight against faith constitutes a trial of the sorest kind. The prayers they say, the Scriptures they read, seem to belong to a region far out of reach, to be untranslatable into the language of everyday work and experience, to have but a tentative, proximate, perhaps, they even think, a conventional, value. It is not with them 'I disbelieve,' or 'I reject,' but 'I cannot realize, appropriate, enter into, and live by.' They walk in dimness, tending to become darkness: perhaps, in reciting or listening to the Creed, they make even desperate efforts to grasp at something solid and substantial behind or above those venerable words; and if still the endeavour fails, if still the haze will not lift, they are tempted to listen to secularism in some one of its more cultured forms, as to a voice saying

'You *feel* that all this is unverifiable. Give up the dream which you once took for a reality; be content with tangible certainties.

"If scanty all we know,
At least 'tis science palpable and pure:
We see! Thus far, our footsteps are secure;
No more we ask than sense and senses show,
And Hope and Faith, vain luxuries, forego."

To such materialistic preachments, advocating a self-abasement which can lead to no exaltation, Mr. Palgrave had thus answered in his earlier poem:—

'If this be all in all,
Life but one mode of force,
Law but the plan which binds
The sequences in course,
All essence, all design
Shut out from mortal ken;
We bow to Nature's fate,
And drop the style of *men*. . . .
But if our life be life,
And thought, and will, and love
Not vague, unconscious airs
That o'er wild harp-strings move;
If consciousness be aught
Of all it seems to be,
And souls are something more
Than lights that gleam and flee;
Though dark the road that leads us thither,
The heart *must* ask its whence and whither.'

So now, in the poem before us, he compares the materialistic influence to the glamour of a Circe, which makes men forget their true home; and then, apparently following in a track indicated by Dr. Mozley in his second lecture on Miracles, he asks, in effect, whether we can, after all, verify by scientific tests the conclusions which we lean on respecting the world of things tangible; whether we can dispense, in *that* act, with presumptions and acts of faith; whether, to be consistent, the sceptic must not carry 'nescience' yet further, until the path of life becomes no thoroughfare; whether, in fine, it were not better to admit, or rather to urge, that alike in things material and things spiritual we have a light which, though partial, is yet true:—

'Tis reason bids you scorn the facile sneer
That bars the search for truth beyond the sphere:
It is the weak who doubt, the strong who hold
The resolute faith where new is one with old.'

We have quoted, perhaps, too much from this book, but, at any rate, more than enough to show that the author has established his place among those 'makers' who have been pleaders at once for righteousness and for faith; that his influence, as far as it is felt, will be altogether in aid of what is noble and lovely and of good report; and that, notwithstanding any objections which may be made to the forms in which he has here and there clothed his thought, he has supplied us with not a few contributions to some future *Golden Treasury.*

ART. II.—LANGEN'S HISTORY OF THE ROMAN CHURCH.

Geschichte der Römischen Kirche, bis zum Pontificate Leo's I. Quellenmässig dargestellt von Dr. JOSEPH LANGEN, Professor an der Universität zu Bonn. (Bonn, 1881.)

THE book before us has those less important qualities which attract students, such, at least, as are not deterred at starting by a German elaborateness of discussion. Its arrangement is excellent. It has an Index and full Table of Contents. Its references, where we have verified them, have proved to be in almost all cases accurate.[1] Moreover, it is excellently printed in a clear Roman type. But it has the greater qualities also which are to be required in history. The student is impressed with the thoroughness of the knowledge on which the work is based. The whole ground is gone elaborately over. No source of information from which light can be thrown on the early history of the Roman Church is neglected. The basis of knowledge seems complete, the investigation thorough-going. Nothing is sacrificed to the desire of popularity. Knowledge, no doubt, goes but a little way in the making of history. We need the temper of criticism to sift and reduce to scientific order and distinction the mass of materials. But here too Professor Langen seems to us eminently qualified for his great task. He is not conservative merely, but critical. He does not primarily defend or attack, but investigates. He is thoroughly in the full light of modern historical science. Once again, criticism must have its basis in sympathy; and Professor Langen has that sympathy in writing Church history which the temper of faith alone seems to be able to give. He writes the history of the Church as a believer in the Church. We have here, then, a history of a most important period and current of Church history by a man of unimpeachable knowledge, sincere faith, and vigorous criticism. Need we say that we believe this work to be a most important addition to ecclesiastical history?

Of course, one who writes on a subject which has been blackened with controversy at every stage cannot avoid a controversial tone, however much the main aim and intention

[1] P. 106, however, note 2, *H. E.* iv. 14, should be *H. E.* iv. 10; and p. 327, Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, i. 121, should apparently be i. 95.

of his work may be, as Professor Langen's is, positive and critical rather than polemical. Professor Langen, in being true to history, finds himself in an attitude of antagonism to those modern Roman claims which have triumphed over it. He represents the position of the Old Catholics; and we cannot forbear to say that if any ecclesiastical position affords, by its extreme anomaly and discomfort to one who really values Church communion, a pledge of the intellectual honesty and disinterestedness of those who occupy it, it is the Old Catholic position. When we read a history of the Roman Church by an Old Catholic divine who is really true to his name, we seem to be having expanded before us the progress of an intellectual conviction which forced a man to cut himself adrift from all that could make his religious position satisfactory and comfortable. An Old Catholic historian ought to be an impartial historian. His convictions have cost him much, and gained him nothing except clearness of conscience.

We proceed, then, to give some account of this important work—to give, we say, some account of it; for it would be impossible, in the space open to us, even to attempt to traverse anew and for ourselves the early life of the Roman Church, and offer an independent judgment, with the grounds it rests upon, on the topics which present themselves. We attempt the humbler task of following the lines of Professor Langen's work, emphasizing points which seem of special interest and importance, and only very occasionally venturing on the ground of divergent opinion.

The Roman Church, then, is exhibited to us in a careful survey of all that concerns its origin as springing out of the Gentile environment of the strictly Jewish body at Rome. A half-developed, half-organized [1] society when S. Paul wrote to it, it receives its completer development under the influence of the personal presence of S. Paul and S. Peter. S. Peter seems to have come to Rome not much sooner, at any rate, than S. Paul left it on the conclusion of the first captivity in A.D. 63. His activity there is marked, Professor Langen holds, probably by his First General Epistle, more certainly by the Gospel of S. Mark. He dates his martyrdom at Rome with hesitation in A.D. 67.

To omit the intervening period,[2] we find a special interest

[1] 'Im Flüsse des Werdens' 'keimartig,' p. 32. But the reality of organization involved in Rom. xii. 5 ff. is emphasized, p. 31.

[2] We notice that the Professor inclines, on external grounds (p. 71), to the traditional later date of the Apocalypse, not noticing the strong *internal* difficulties of this view.

attaching to the account given here of the episcopal organization of the Church of Rome at the period of the Epistle of Clement. Our author regards the—in the modern sense of the word—episcopal form of Church government as having been implanted on the Churches by the influence of S. John. 'The monarchical government of the Asiatic communities may be fairly attributed to the Apostle S. John' (p. 97). The earlier monarchical government of the Church of Jerusalem has special and personal causes which would not hold elsewhere: the monarchical form of government as impressed by S. John is Catholic, and belongs to the Church as such. It obtained everywhere from a very early date, but in part of the West less rapidly than elsewhere. When Hegesippus visited Rome in the middle of the second century, he did not find a recognized list of the succession of bishops there, but made it (p. 101).[1] In making this list he may, Dr. Langen with great probability conceives, have given scope to his Jewish instincts (pp. 100, 101), and recorded as successors bishops who were really contemporaries. So Dr. Langen accounts for the uncertainties about the early succession of the bishops at Rome.[2] Traces of this late development of episcopal organization he finds even in the occasional vagueness of the language of the 'Shepherd' of Hermas (p. 125). At any rate, he throws himself fully into the point of view which regards the government of the Church in Clement's day as collegiate.[3] This view alone he regards as critically tenable. On the other hand, he is equally emphatic in the position that each member of the Episcopal College was regarded as the inheritor of the full power of the Apostolic ministry. 'The ordinary Church-presidents (of the Clementine period) are called successors of the Apostles.' 'Through the simple ceremony of laying on of hands, combined perhaps with the invocation of the Holy Ghost, the Apostles handed on to the bishops or presbyters the full ecclesiastical powers, complete and undiminished, to all in like measure.' This he regards as certain (p. 82), and it was therefore from motives of expedience that the 'episcopal'—*i.e.*, if the word may be allowed, mon-episcopal—form of

[1] Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 30.

[2] He reckons the tradition of the succession as reaching back with security only to Xystus (p. 103).

[3] P. 71, 80–83. The evidence drawn from the comparison of the Church officers to the three orders of the Jewish hierarchy he sets aside (p. 87, note 1) as too vague to stand against the clear implication of the Epistle.

government superseded the collegiate in the Churches; that is to say, it was found convenient 'for the future (p. 83) to hand over the full ecclesiastical authority in each community to a single individual, leaving to the rest of the presidents only a diminished share in the ecclesiastical powers.'

'We can therefore,' so the Professor sums up, 'neither defend the position which represents Christ as having Himself instituted two sharply-distinguished Church offices, the Episcopate and the Presbyterate—a position which is historically and exegetically untenable—nor the other position, which represents the Episcopate as a discovery of the sub-Apostolic age, but that which is opposed to both these, and represents the *Presbyterate as having developed* out of the limitation to a single individual of the succession to the full episcopal power.'

It is our earnest belief that the Church will be only a gainer, alike in ecclesiastical polemics as in historical accuracy, if this theory of the development of the Ministry be at any rate accepted as tenable. It cannot surely be impressed on people too clearly that the basis of the ecclesiastical doctrine of ministerial authority lies *primarily*, not in the Apostolic antiquity of the threefold form of the ministry, but—*primarily, we say*—in the Divine authority of the principle of ministerial *delegation*; and to this principle the witness of the Clementine Epistle is not ambiguous.[1]

We have not time to linger over the interesting section (§ ix.) which Dr. Langen devotes to the 'Shepherd' of Hermas. Accepting the later date of this book, in accordance with the Canon of Muratori,[2] he finds in it the record of an earnest appeal of the prophetic spirit to the Church of an age when Christianity was becoming worldly; an appeal to earnest repentance on the ground that the quickly-coming day of Christ was only lingering through God's long suffering in order to give the elect time to prepare (p. 131). Only just referring to this in passing, and omitting not a little else that is interesting, we will endeavour to give rather more careful attention to the picture which Dr. Langen draws of

[1] Dr. Langen does not, as far as we can see, make any allusion to Bishop Lightfoot's work on the Epistle of Clement, nor to Bishop Wordsworth's admirable emendation of the text, Δαναΐδες καὶ Δίρκαι (chap. vi. Langen, p. 52) into νεάνιδες παιδίσκαι. Later, again, we notice no allusion to Bishop Wordsworth's work on Hippolytus. Indeed (with the exception of allusions to Canon Mason's work on the Diocletian Persecution, and a note on p. 559) we have not noticed in this book much trace of English contributions to theological science.

[2] About A.D. 140. Montanism he regards as the distorted expression of the same spirit which animates the *Shepherd* (p. 132).

the position of the Church of Rome in the end of the second century in relation to the Church's general function of witnessing to the Apostolic tradition.

The Church never felt the need of a secure and firm doctrinal tradition more keenly than in the second century, under the pressure of all the various forms of Gnostic aberration and Montanist enthusiasm; and no part of the Church had more abundant opportunity of becoming conscious of this need than the Church of Rome. Rome was, from her imperial position, the point of convergence for the intercourse of the civilized world (p. 109). Men of all lands went thither. Hence this was the easiest place from which to scatter the seeds of a new doctrine. Each innovator, each author of a new system or enthusiasm, felt that if he could once establish a secure school at Rome he would ensure the universal diffusion of his ideas. Hence the fact with which history presents us, that leader after leader of the heretical tendencies of the second century came to Rome. In Rome, then, as much as anywhere, was the need felt of stable tradition. In two ways did the Church set herself to meet this need. She made her first formal efforts to collect the Canon of the Scriptures, with which heretics were playing fast and loose. The Canon of Muratori presents us with an early—probably the first—effort of Latin Christianity in this direction (p. 164). But it was apparent that the Scriptures could not stand alone. Christianity was not a new thing from age to age to be gathered from written documents afresh according to the fancy of the readers; it was a living tradition of doctrine, and a living store of grace committed to an organic body, the Church. Thus over against the constant outpouring of novel Gnostic conceptions, the Church set her stable and constant and universal tradition, preserved in her ministerial succession in the Apostolic sees. The Church stands out as the witness and preserver of primitive tradition. The Church is a witness. In each Apostolic see presides a successor of those to whom the Apostles committed the Apostolic tradition.[1] Do you want to learn the Apostolic verity? You must go and seek it there 'where is the store of the Divine graces,[2] and from those with whom is the succession of the Church from the Apostles.' Hence the significance of the Apostolic succession. It is the pledge in each Church of the continuity of the tradition. And the further security of the unchanged character of the

[1] The Apostles, Professor Langen notices, are not themselves reckoned *among* the Bishops, but as institutors of the Bishops (pp. 168, 169).

[2] Iren. iv. 26. 5; Langen, p. 169.

tradition lies in its *universality*. If the relation of the Church to the truth be that of an originative, promulgative *authority*, then she would best fulfil her function through a single central voice; but if (as Irenæus and Tertullian, to whom we specially owe the *formulating* of this conception of the Church tradition, teach) the Church's function is the perhaps humbler one of *witness*, the security of this witness will lie in the *agreement of many and distinct voices*, in *consent*. 'Ecquid verisimile est,' says Tertullian, with his incomparable power of compressing an argument into a phrase, 'ut tot ac tantæ ecclesiæ in unam fidem erraverint?' The strength of the ecclesiastical witness lies in the agreement, the consent of East and West, not in the subordination of the tradition of one part of the Church to the tradition of another. Thus the Roman Church to Tertullian or Irenæus represents one stream of Apostolic witness; and yet the latter perceives in it a special capacity of witness, not such as to make it possible to dispense with the consent of the other parts of the Church, not such as to give it any kind of relation to the truth, other than that of witnessing to a once delivered tradition, but still a special position in relation to this witness. This peculiarity of the Roman Church to Irenæus, lies, as Professor Langen explains his conception, in its 'microcosmic' character. Rome's position in the Church is based on her position in the Empire. She is the centre to which all converge. 'As Rome was the world of that age, in little'—'the epitome of the world,' its 'council-chamber,'—'drawing all nations, cults, schools, tendencies into her bosom, so into the Roman Church streamed believers from all sides together;' and the witness of the Church at Rome had a universality, a microcosmic character to which no other Church could lay claim. 'To this Church,' so Professor Langen renders[1] words which have been the subject of much discussion, 'on account of its pre-eminent position, every Church—that is, the faithful from all sides—must needs come together, and in it the Apostolic tradition has been always preserved by Christians from all parts.'

Nor was this the only special circumstance which thrust greatness upon the Roman Church of this date. To her microcosmic position in the Empire and the Church must be added the religious reverence which accrued to her from association with the great names of Peter and of Paul, and the

[1] Professor Langen has certainly gone further than anyone else in the direction of making his rendering reasonably certain (p. 171, note 1, and p. 172, note 1).

influence which an already old tradition of generous charity to needy Churches had given her. The peace of the Church since the accession of Commodus in A.D. 180 fostered the wealth and influence of the Roman Church. It is under these circumstances that, in the person of Victor, history presents us with the first instance of 'Roman aggression' (p. 186). 'Through his attempt [to excommunicate the Asiatic Churches on the matter of Easter observance] he gave expression for the first time to the idea of the Universal Church finding its constitutional centre of unity in the Church of Rome, even though, as would be expected, this idea was not on the occasion of this first attempt presented in a firmly formulated shape.' The attempt of Victor is important as calling our attention to the early existence of a Roman claim, however undeveloped, to be something which other Churches were not. His complete failure to secure any recognition of his authority (pp. 189–191), and the treatment of his claim by his contemporary, S. Irenæus, and the historian Eusebius, are also important, because they emphasize the fact that from its origin downward the Roman claim is sectional, and from the first in tendency schismatic, wholly wanting in that equal recognition in all parts of the Church which alone could make the Roman claims an integral part of authoritative Christianity. Romanism is one tendency in Christianity—powerful, and, for good and evil, influential—but not the whole of Christianity.

A remarkable connection of discoveries made at widely different epochs in widely different parts of the world has resulted in shedding a light as vivid as it is strange and partial over the history and position of the Roman Church in the obscure period of the early third century. The rapid Latinizing of the Roman Church in the latter half of the century obliterated so completely the memory of the days when its theology was Greek, that Eusebius and Jerome were ignorant of events in her history which the strange accidents of discovery have laid bare to us. A manuscript[1] discovered at Mount Athos in the nineteenth century, brought into unexpected connection with a statue and an inscription discovered at Rome in the sixteenth, reveals to us the great S. Hippolytus—a man 'who stood while his writings were extant in point of authority . . . in the very first rank of theologians of the Ante-Nicene period; and perhaps has no rival at all during that period as a theologian except his master, S. Irenæus,' a

[1] Originally published as the *Philosophumena* of Origen, now recognized as the *Refutatio omnium Hæresium* of Hippolytus.

men whose name a breath of ecclesiastical censure has never even dimmed"—in the strange light of a violent opponent of his contemporary, the Pope Callistus. This may now be taken as an almost accepted fact in ecclesiastical history. It is S. Hippolytus who pours out the vials of his wrath upon the Pope as a character disreputable from his antecedents, as the destroyer of ecclesiastical discipline in the Church of Rome, as a heresiarch in a direction akin to that of Sabellius. This much may be taken as almost certain. We may take it also as certain that S. Hippolytus and Callistus stand against one another in the Church of Rome[1] as representatives of two rival schools of theology and discipline. Among theologians who were seeking to formulate the Doctrine of the Trinity were some who tended to emphasise the distinction of the Son from the Father and His subordination in such a way as, occasionally at least, in some of their expressions, to have given the Arians of the next century a plausible excuse for quoting them in their own defence. To this school belonged Tertullian and Hippolytus. On the other side was a school of theologians representing an opposite tendency, accused from the first by their opponents of Patripassianism, and at any rate using language which found its natural explanation in the Sabellian heresy. To this *zeuma* at any rate belonged Callistus. This division in theological doctrine was accompanied with a division on matters of discipline. The subordinationist theologians, Tertullian and Hippolytus, advocated a severity of discipline which led Tertullian to Montanism, and has associated traditionally the name of Hippolytus with a Novatianism before Novatian. Callistus, on the other hand, clearly identified himself with laxer tendencies in discipline. Thus much may be regarded as certain. Beyond this is the area of controversy. In the controversy between Hippolytus and Callistus how far are we to accept the *ex parte* statements of the former vehement theologian about the Bishop of Rome? Was Callistus an 'heresiarch *ex cathedrâ*,' as Hippolytus says he was? On the one side we have the Bishop of Lincoln accepting simply the statements of S. Hippolytus, and making it matter of history that you have in Callistus a pronounced heresiarch of the Sabellian school on the throne of Rome. On the other hand, you have Dr. Döllinger issuing what has been called an 'Apologia pro Callisto,' but at any rate making it only reasonable to accept Hippolytus' statement with a great deal of reserve. Words-

[1] Newman, *Tracts, Theological and Ecclesiastical* (pp. 220–222).

[2] A.D. 218–223, approximately.

worth and Döllinger have been at issue again as to Hippolytus' statements about Callistus' personal character and his charges against his adversary of gross laxity in matters of discipline. Here again it seems impossible to accept Hippolytus' statement except with very great limitations. On the whole, the controversy has resulted in ranking Hippolytus among theologians whose zeal has been too much for their candour in dealing with an opponent's character and doctrine. This is Dr. Langen's conclusion, who, however, takes a severer view of Callistus than Dr. Döllinger. A very interesting history of the rival tendencies in theology and discipline leads him to a conclusion that Callistus, who excommunicated Sabellius at the same time as he charged Hippolytus with ditheism, was aiming, like Praxeas and Noetus, at a theology which would occupy a middle position; while at the same time there seems no doubt that his theology was vague and unsatisfactory, tending at the very least to reduce the distinction of the Father and the Son to one merely 'accidental,' and to make the real Biblical distinction to be the result only of the Incarnation —a distinction really rather between the Divine and human natures in Christ than between the two Persons in the Trinity (p. 214). On the other hand, Dr. Langen regards Hippolytus' own theology as open to somewhat severe impeachment. We have, in fact, in the theological relation of Hippolytus and Callistus the rivalry of two opposing schools, neither by any means free from reproach, but both together, through their antagonism, a means by which the Church was helped to arrive at a securer expression of the Triune Being of God than Scripture revealed.

As to disciplinary matters, Dr. Langen admits the justness of Hippolytus' case against Callistus more fully than Dr. Döllinger. Callistus, he thinks, did undoubtedly effect a complete and dangerous revolution in the discipline of the Roman Church[1] (p. 258).

And who was Hippolytus? A bishop, as Eusebius and Jerome knew, and as he himself in the newly-discovered 'Refutatio' implies. But bishop of what see? Eusebius and Jerome knew not. A late legend had made him Bishop of Portus, a subordinate of the See of Rome; but this theory, though patronized by Bishop Wordsworth, who is anxious to

[1] Dr. Langen even admits the probability of Callistus having patronized the practice of re-baptism and introduced it into the Roman Church (p. 257, note 1). This, however, seems, in view of Pope Stephen's statements thirty years later about the tradition of his Church, quite impossible.

remove anything discreditable from the fair fame of Hippolytus, may be said to have been overthrown by Dr. Döllinger. There would seem little room for doubt that Hippolytus allowed himself to be carried so far in his opposition to Callistus as to allow himself to create a schism in the Church of Rome, as Novatian did somewhat later; he was for a while a schismatic Bishop of Rome—the first Antipope. The schism seems to have endured as late as the year 235, when it may be accepted as history that Hippolytus was banished with Bishop Pontian to Sardinia.[1]

Through the breach, then, in the cloud which shrouds the history of the Church of Rome in the first half of the third century, we discern not indeed a vile heresiarch on the See of Rome denounced by his orthodox suffragan, as Bishop Wordsworth would present the picture to us, but a Bishop of Rome representing at least a very dangerous theology and a very lax and revolutionary tendency in discipline, and a theologian of good reputation appearing in the ambiguous position of rival and schismatical Bishop of Rome. A strange and unexpected picture! This, at least, it emphasizes to us: how little the œcumenical reputation of a theologian of this age of the Church was affected by his relation of open hostility to the accepted Bishops of Rome.

The theological laxity of the Bishop of Rome at this period is in marked contrast to the dogmatic determinateness of the theological utterance of Pope S. Dionysius towards the end of the century (pp. 355–357, Langen). All taint of Sabellianism has, at any rate, vanished from the See of Rome in the interval. When Dionysius of Alexandria gives occasion to the faithful to doubt his orthodoxy on the proper Divinity of the Son, Dionysius of Rome is appealed to by the orthodox, and in his reply gives an elaborate exposition of the Trinitarian faith, to which is assigned by Dr. Langen the immense credit of first indicating the true mean in formulating the doctrine of the Trinity between Sabellianism and Subordinationism.

There is a great deal in Professor Langen's work of which we cannot give even a sketch. We must ignore, for example,

[1] Langen differs on details connected with the end of the schism and the death of Hippolytus from Döllinger. See pp. 230 and 268. Dr. Salmon (*Dic. of Christian Biog.* vol. iii. pp. 90, 91) has a suggestion, which is at least interesting, that Hippolytus as '*ἐθνῶν ἐπίσκοπος*,' *i.e.* (possibly) assistant bishop of foreign Christians at Rome, may have had episcopal consecration prior to the schism. This would make the whole transaction much less incredible.

his discussions of the literary remains of the Church of Rome.[1] What it seems best to do is to notice the results at which he arrives in describing the development of the claims of the Roman Church in their relation to the whole Church.

We start, then, from the self-assertion of the Roman See involved in Stephen's excommunication—for such Professor Langen holds it to have been (p. 327)[2]—of those portions of the Church who held and practised the rebaptism of heretics. In this we find a reproduction of the temper and tone exhibited by Victor in the preceding century in his treatment of the Quartodecimans, but there is something added now in the special authority claimed for the tradition of the Roman Church, and in the claim which Stephen certainly made as the successor of S. Peter (p. 330). It is, however, to the Bishops of Rome, not of this but of the later fourth century, that we can attribute the more definite advance in the claim of the Roman See.

Circumstances during the fourth and fifth centuries were thrusting greatness upon Rome. The Christianizing of the Empire by Constantine (p. 850), 'involving, as it did gradually in more than one respect, the secularizing of the Church and the transference of State-forms to Church organization, had for its consequence the elevation of Roman authority in Church as well as State.' Men were used to look to Rome as the centre of civilization and œcumenical organization, and the identification of the Empire with Christianity helped the tendency to transfer to ecclesiastical Rome the secular prestige. To this we may add that the decay of the Western Empire, after its separation from the East on the death of Theodosius (A.D. 395), and the abandonment of Rome as the seat of the Western Empire at the beginning of the fifth century, left continually more and more of the old

[1] Professor Langen hesitates to accept the general conclusion which ascribes the commentaries of 'Ambrosiaster' to the deacon Hilary, on the ground that the pseudo-Augustinian *Quæstiones in V. et N. T.* may, with the highest probability, be ascribed to the same author, and this work is by a *Presbyter*. Langen inclines to ascribe both the *Quæstiones* and the Commentaries to the Luciferian presbyter *Faustinus* (pp. 599–602).

[2] He characterizes Hefele's strenuous denial of this (*Conciliengesch.* i. 95) as something 'inconceivable' (note 2). The Archbishop of Canterbury, in his article 'Cyprian' (*Dic. of Christian Biog.*), is not altogether with Dr. Langen in this, nor, according to Augustine (*De Baptismo*, lib. v. cap. xxv. § 36), did a separation actually occur; but the letter of S. Fermilian would certainly imply that Stephen intended actually to excommunicate all the rebaptizing party.

imperial Roman dignity to become the inheritance of the Roman Church.

Again, the circumstances of the Church, no less than those of the Empire, favoured the elevation of the See of Rome. She was remote from all the theological disputes which harassed and dissipated the East. She stood aloof from the violence and heat of the discussion in dignified repose, attracting appellants from all sides who did her honour. 'Circumstances,' then, we say, were thrusting greatness on the See of Rome. There is a Divine Providence in circumstances, and it would seem impossible to doubt that the Providence of God intended for the See of Rome a unique position among the Churches of the world; but what seems equally to be written in history is that, not resting satisfied with the splendid opportunities which God gave her, she used those opportunities in such spirit of self-asserting arrogance as made her reckless of historic truth, reckless of equity and justice, where her own claims were in question.

The temper which from first to last in the epoch of her aggrandisement characterized the See of Rome and is identified with her exaltation is not—we feel on absolutely safe ground in saying this—is not, cannot be, a temper which has the blessing upon it of the God of truthfulness, of equity, of mercy. As surely as history presents us with a Divine purpose for the See of Rome, so surely the conviction is forced upon us that the actual development of the Roman power is a record of the way in which the Divine purpose is parodied and distorted by unfaithfulness.

Dr. Langen takes the epoch of Damasus and Siricius as representing the beginning of a new development in the Roman claim. Siricius, in his reply to the Spanish bishops, dated February 11, 385, which Dr. Langen characterizes as the 'first Papal Decretal' (p. 611), proclaims himself unmistakeably in the character of an 'Oberbischof' of the Universal Church. 'He writes his decree with full feeling of Papal authority' (p. 617). The claim of this authority is yet beginning: perhaps it is now made for the first time, but made it certainly is. That Siricius asserts a Papal supremacy over the whole Church is undeniable. The zeal for the Christian religion belongs especially to him who, as Peter's successor, has to care for the whole Church. The Roman See is the Apostolic Rock upon which Christ built His Church (p. 617).[1]

[1] The remarks (p. 618) on Siricius' doctrine of the invalidity of confirmation administered by heretics are interesting.

This claim which Siricius promulgates receives a new development in the doctrine of Innocent on the teaching authority of the Church of Rome. Rome is, in Innocent's reply to the African Bishops (p. 736), the source of the final confirmation and authority of all ecclesiastical decisions. In the Roman See are '*arcana*'—a secret deposit of Divine tradition on which the faithful are to draw for their decisions as to what judgment is to be passed in doubtful matters (p. 737). The Roman See has thus immanent in herself—if we may so speak, through the indwelling of Peter in his successors—a perpetual spring of Divine tradition and the perpetual authority of universal discipline. To this the præ-Leonine claim of the Bishops of Rome amounts.

This claim is Roman, not Catholic; local, not universal. It springs up and grows in complete independence of the traditions of the Eastern Church. If it is essential to an article of the Christian faith that it should be part and parcel of the Christian development everywhere, then the special prerogative of the Roman See is not of the essence of the Christian faith, for Eastern Christianity knew nothing of it. Professor Langen shows us how completely alien from the conceptions of the Eastern Church at the period of the Council of Nicæa is the thought that the Roman Church stands in any special relation to the tradition of the faith or the government of the Church.[1] She has her primacy of honour in her own region. This is recognized, and nothing more. Indeed, from the fifth century onward, the Roman Church has never liked the simple history of the Nicene Council. She interpolated at an early date a clause about her own primacy into its sixth canon. She quoted by the mouth of Pope after Pope, in spite of all evidence to the contrary forced upon her, the Canons of Sardica as of Nicene authority. Legend has been busy with the Council of Nicæa. If we read the narrative of it in the pages of a modern Ultramontane work,[2] the result is enough to astonish anyone with any conception of what history means.

This ignoring of any special relation of the See of Rome to the truth of the Church is very obvious in the case of

[1] Professor Langen, summing up the conflicting evidence on the subject of the presidency of the First General Council, thinks the question is in any exact sense beyond solution (p. 409).

[2] It is, for example, a saddening but instructive task to examine critically the page about the Council of Nicæa in Mr. Allies' 'See of S. Peter,' p. 155, 3rd edition.

S. Athanasius.[1] Whether he looks back to the past, and is defending the orthodoxy of his predecessor Dionysius, who made his apology to his contemporary and namesake the Bishop of Rome, or is speaking of the Roman Bishops of his own time, he seems to know nothing of any doctrinal authority in their See. When Liberius fell away from the authority of the Nicene Council, repudiated Athanasius, and signed a compromising creed, Athanasius' kindly apology for him is couched in a tone which he could not possibly have used had the collapse of the Roman Bishop, and his desertion of the orthodox standpoint, been any special shock to the mind of the great champion of the imperilled truth.[2] It is true that Easterns from time to time in appealing to Rome for protection use language more acceptable to Roman ears,[3] but it is not the way with appellants to measure their language in addressing their patrons;[4] and when the Eastern Church acts in corporate capacity, it shows what sort of primacy it recognizes in the Roman See—a primacy of honour grounded especially on imperial position, and none other. Otherwise the Councils of Constantinople and Chalcedon could not have spoken as they did—

'The Fathers properly gave the primacy to old Rome, because it was the imperial city, and the 150 bishops (at Constantinople) being moved with the same intention, gave equal privileges to the most holy throne of new Rome, judging with reason that the city which was honoured with the sovereignity and enjoyed equal privilege with the elder Rome, should also be magnified like her in ecclesiastical matters, being the second after her.'

So spoke the Fathers of Chalcedon. Could words suggest a more complete ignoring of any special doctrinal and disciplinary position in the See of Rome? We have voluminous works of S. Chrysostom. We have his Commentary on our Lord's words to S. Peter, 'On this rock I will build my Church.' Is not his silence suggestive of just this same ignoring of Roman claims? He either does not know them or does not notice them.[5] Eastern Christianity in its whole growth and fabric is independent of Rome.[6]

Dr. Langen devotes some careful pages to the Council of

[1] Langen, p. 450. [2] P. 479. [3] P. 851.

[4] Langen, p. 809, shows the *motive* apparent in some language of S. Cyril's.

[5] See Langen, p. 683, on his appeal to Rome.

[6] Dr. Langen points out that the Council of Constantinople represents to a certain extent not merely independence of Rome but antagonism to her (p. 560).

Ephesus and the position of the Roman See in relation to it. The point which seems to emerge in this Council is that while (1) the See of Rome occupies now an altogether different position to that which it occupied in the fourth century, and (2) the alliance of Cyril, from various motives,[1] with Rome brought Rome to the fore in connexion with the great champion of orthodoxy, and gave her an opportunity of making her claims of doctrinal authority heard in the East, on the other hand the Eastern Bishops are no more than silent. They give no kind of recognition to Roman claims. The faith is decided on the old basis of œcumenical consent, and Vincent of Lerins[2] takes the procedure of the Council of Ephesus as the current example of that method of arriving at the truth through *consent of East and West* which most rapidly disposes of Papal claims.

It remains to notice the last chapter of this book, dealing with the attitude of the great Western and African teachers towards the Roman Church. In the language of Ambrose there is not much special significance. His reverence towards the See of Rome indeed is well known. He takes communion with the Church of Rome on one occasion (p. 852) as identical with communion with the Catholic Church; but this language, though it admits of being easily used for a controversial purpose, involves no theory, involves indeed nothing beyond the fact that the best practical test by which a stranger in any Western district could make it clear to himself that any Bishop was a Catholic, and not a Luciferian or other schismatic, was to ask him whether he was in communion with the See of Rome.

But the language of S. Jerome is fuller and more significant. Jerome, in this as in many controversies, may be quoted on both sides. He was a man in whom the merging of passion and reason produces a result in the way of argument more surprising sometimes than satisfying. His vigorous logical powers were too often at the service of the strongest emotion. When amidst the turmoil of the East he feels the security and dogmatic repose of the Roman Church, he throws himself with warmth and eagerness into her cause. The communion of Rome is the communion of the Church. 'Who eats the lamb outside this house is profane.'[3] Often,

[1] P. 824, on Cyril's jealousy of Constantinople throwing him into harmony with the aims of Rome.

[2] Langen, p. 826, note 1. We wonder Dr. Langen has not said more about the *rule of faith* as formulated by Vincent of Lerins.

[3] See p. 535. Dr. Langen attempts to throw doubt upon the meaning

again, Jerome takes the faith of the Church of Rome as the safe antithesis to Origenistic tendencies. Indeed, it would not be strange if a man like Jerome, associated as closely as he was with an actual Bishop of Rome, had thrown himself for good and all into the extreme Roman tendency. As a fact, however, when Jerome finds himself in opposition to an actual tendency of the Roman Church, he makes short and contemptuous work with her authority. The deacons of Rome pleaded this authority for their exaltation of the third order to what Jerome thought an unseemly height. What is the Roman Church, then, Jerome demands, which the other Churches are not (p. 855)? If it is a question of authority, *the world is greater than a city.* Wherever a bishop is, be it at Rome, or Eugubium, or Constantinople, or Rhegium, or Alexandria, he has the same worth (*ejusdem meriti est*), the same priesthood. Riches or poverty make no bishops higher or lower. . . . The customs of Rome are only those of one city. No words, as Dr. Langen remarks, can contradict the Papal system more directly than these. It is nothing less than dishonest to quote Jerome's utterances about the See of Rome in one tone without quoting them in the other also.

A special and peculiar interest attaches to the theory of the Roman See which developed itself in the African Church. This shall be the last point to which we will call attention.

We attribute to S. Cyprian specially the formulation of the doctrine of Church Unity as finding its embodiment and certificate in the Episcopate. Each duly-ordained bishop is to S. Cyprian the inheritor of the full power and authority of that episcopate, which exists one and indivisible, deriving from the one Spirit, in the Church. To each bishop is intrusted the full exercise of this authority, and, as Cyprian formulates his doctrine, he makes the individual bishop responsible to none over him except God. The individual canonical bishop has the whole in himself, just as each Apostle had in himself the fulness of Apostolic authority. The importance which Cyprian assigned to the preservation of visible communion amongst bishops makes it plain that he must have been ready to admit that this theory would require modification in statement and practice; but in his relations to the Bishop of Rome in the matter of Rebaptism,

of these words; not, we think, with success. On the next page he says this passage is (note 1) the only exception (if it be so) to the generalization that in Patristic literature the *See of Peter* is never called the Foundation of the Church. He, however, himself (p. 617) chronicles another exception in 'the first Papal decree.'

in repudiating what he considered his arrogant assertion of authority, S. Cyprian emphasizes his conception of the full independence and essential equality of each Bishop.[1]

There is still place, however, left for the peculiar honour which attaches to the Church and See of Rome. The Bishop of Rome is the successor of S. Peter, and S. Peter occupied a peculiar position among the Apostles. Not that he had anything which the others had not, but that which was given to all was first given to him as a *symbol of unity.* S. Peter has a representative function: he represents in his single self the Apostolic and therefore the Episcopal commission. S. Peter is therefore, symbolically, the predecessor of all bishops, as the first representative holder of the Episcopal commission. In a sense, all bishops inherit his commission and are his successors, but in a special sense this is true of the Bishops of Rome. Thus, something of the symbolic and representative capacity of S. Peter belongs to the Bishops of Rome. The See of Rome S. Cyprian speaks of as the 'ecclesia principalis,' whence, in the person of Peter, the Episcopal unity had its origin.[2]

This peculiar position of the Church of Rome is emphasized again in the writings of S. Optatus of Milevis against the Donatists. This Church gains a dignity from being, in a special sense, that 'See of Peter' which, in its representative capacity, is *the one Episcopal see* in which all bishops share. 'The See of Peter,' Dr. Langen says (p. 858), 'is the one ecclesiastical see in which all the Apostles and their successors the bishops in equal measure participate, which is called after Peter, because he first (to emphasize symbolically the unity of the Church) was put in possession of it.' Thus Optatus speaks distinctly of the legitimate Episcopal succession in *Africa* as the *See of Peter*, the 'See of Cyprian or Peter:' Catholic bishops, as a whole, again, are spoken of as bound by succession to Peter. The See of Peter is present everywhere in the Episcopate; it is the only see; just as in another passage the Seven Churches of Asia are, in their representative capacity, the only Churches who have the Holy Ghost, and what is not in communion with them is declared profane, because they represent the Church of the Apostolic age.[3] It is in this sense that to be one with the See of Peter

[1] See Langen, § xxiii. pp. 333 *seq.*

[2] On the words which have occasioned S. Cyprian, of all men, to be credited with holding Papal Infallibility, see Langen, p. 341.

[3] See especially *De Schism. Don.* ii. 6; and of the necessity of union with Greek Churches, vi. 3.

is an essential of Church life, or, as is still more distinctly stated, the Catholic Church *has only one See.* 'The sees of all Churches are, all equally, different representatives of the one ideal see' (p. 859): all equally in essence, only a special dignity belongs to the See of Rome as, in a special sense as well as in the general, 'the See of Peter,' and the see which therefore comes naturally to hand as the symbol of present unity.

Again in Augustine, the greatest of African teachers, reappears this peculiar position assigned to the See of Rome as special representative of that See of Peter which, in its essence, is present in each Episcopate. It is difficult sometimes to be sure whether S. Augustine is speaking of the Episcopate as a whole as succeeding to Peter, or of the Bishops of Rome in particular. When he bids the Donatists 'reckon the bishops from the very See of Peter, and in that array of Fathers consider the succession of one to another,' because 'this see is the rock which the proud gates of hell overcome not,' he seems to be speaking unmistakably of *all* the bishops as the successors of Peter (p. 868), though no doubt a specially representative position is naturally conceived to inhere in the 'See of Peter' in Rome, as in the Apostle himself in the Apostolic College.

And thus we approach a question with which we propose briefly to deal, in reference to S. Augustine and this African conception of the See of S. Peter: and here, for the moment, we leave the ground covered by Professor Langen. Does not, it may be asked, the assignment of this representative function to the See of Rome make union with Rome an essential of unity with the Church? Would not S. Augustine practically make the sin of schism to consist in breaking off from that visible Church communion which finds its representative centre in the See of Rome?

This question may be answered thus. It is quite true that S. Augustine does lay immense stress on Catholic communion: on the free union of intercourse between different parts of the Church. He does not seem in arguing with the Donatists to contemplate the case of a divided Church in which each branch, though divided from the others, will yet remain part of the one Church, essentially one in the unity of its life, underlying all outward divisions.[1] He does not dis-

[1] See, however, *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, cap. xiii. § 33, on the division of Judah and Israel. There is, moreover, no specification of Rome as the centre of union. The main stress is laid on the *universality* of the Church as against Donatist exclusiveness.

tinguish accurately between the 'unity of the Spirit' and 'the bond of peace.' S. Augustine, we admit, then does not contemplate breaches of external communion in the Church. That is, he was not prophetic. But neither does S. Augustine contemplate any part of the Catholic Church perishing before the end. He does not seem to believe it possible that where the Catholic Church has been founded in any part of the world it can vanish away. The divisions of the Church no more contradict the Augustinian theory of Church unity than the Mohammedan conquests contradict his theory of Church perpetuity.[1] Essentially S. Augustine's theory of Church unity is the same as S. Cyprian's—a unity not of external government, but of transmitted life; and this real identity of Augustine's and Cyprian's conception of Church unity leads us to notice the identity of Augustine's and Cyprian's conception of Church authority and the sin of schism. If there is any book which is antipapal in its conception of Church authority and which throws the charge of schism back upon the Roman Church itself, it is S. Augustine's work *De Baptismo.* S. Augustine there, in arguing with the Donatists, is at pains to make a clear distinction between S. Cyprian's position, in holding to Rebaptism as firmly as he did, and theirs. In S. Cyprian it is blameless: blameless, though, as we know, he had, in adhering to his judgment and the judgment of the African Church, to repudiate utterly the authority of the Bishop of Rome. Yet S. Cyprian was to S. Augustine blameless in the matter, because he did not repudiate the authority of any universal council as the Donatists did. Nothing is superior to a local council, in S. Augustine's theory of Church government, but a universal council; and from this point of view he justifies S. Cyprian's conduct in holding to his own—even though erroneous—opinion and practice (in face though it was of Papal condemnation) till adequate Church authority had been brought to bear upon it.

Once again, S. Augustine makes the sin of schism in the case of the Donatists to consist in their *intolerance*, in which respect he contrasts them with S. Cyprian, that is to say, he holds up S. Cyprian as the pattern of the *unschismatic temper*, because, though he held to the judgment which his local Church had done its best to form in a difficult matter, he did not make the point a condition of communion with others—*there being no universal Church authority in the matter*—but held his own opinion and let others hold theirs. It was a

[1] *De Unit. Eccl.* cap. xvii. §§ 44, 45.

matter of great importance in Cyprian's conception, nothing less than the legitimate administration of baptism, which was at stake; yet he did not go one whit beyond his own rights—he held his own judgment, and let others hold theirs, and kept communion with them as far as in him lay. And this is the unschismatical temper, while the schismatical temper is just that which enforces as the condition of communion with others matters which, right or wrong, fall short of that full Catholic authority which alone justifies the enforcement of opinion as a condition of communion. Has there not, then, we ask, been a good deal of this temper of schism abroad in the Church? and is there any Church in whose history it appears more prominently than in hers who from age to age has made new claims, and in making them has enforced them where she had power to do it, and issued her excommunications on those who would not accept decrees which fell very far short of œcumenical authority? Surely if the temper of schism is the temper which raises opinions which may be tenable, but are not authoritative, into conditions of communion, the Church of Rome has a good deal to answer for in this matter.

This African conception of Church unity and the relation of the See of Rome to it, is the last point with which we have space to deal in our review of Dr. Langen's work. There are many matters of interest which fall within the scope of this book on which we have not even touched. We trust enough has been said to direct the attention of students to a very important book, and indicate the general tendency of its conclusions.

ART. III.—FOLK-TALES.

1. *Russian Folk-Tales.* By W. R. S. RALSTON, M.A., &c. (London, 1873.)
2. *Tibetan Tales, derived from Indian Sources.* Translated from the Tibetan of the Kah-Gyur. By F. ANTON VON SCHIEFNER. Done into English from the German, with an Introduction, by W. R. S. RALSTON, M.A. (London, 1882.)

MR. RALSTON is a charming storyteller, but he is more than this. He possesses such a familiar acquaintance with the fast growing literature of the subject of this paper, that the Introductions and notes by which his stories are accompanied are full of instruction. To these we must refer the reader who may desire fuller information on that subject than, in the space of a short article, we can furnish. All that we can aim at is to stimulate a little interest in it, and endeavour to show that it is not unworthy of attention. With this view we borrow at the outset the following tale from Mr. Ralston's pages.

There once lived, so runs the story, an old man with his wife and his three daughters. The eldest of these, being the child of a previous marriage, was treated very unkindly by her stepmother, a typical *injusta noverca*. Her life was one of incessant toil, and her stepmother was for ever finding fault with her, while her stepsisters, taking pattern by their mother, were for ever teasing her. It was their delight to make her cry, though she was so good and patient that she did her utmost to be of service to them. The father loved his eldest daughter, and would have made her life happier if he had been able; but he was feeble, his wife was a scold, and he could not manage her daughters.

Now, the wife wanted to get rid of her stepdaughter. So one night she said to her husband, 'I say, old man, let us get Marfa married.' Then she told him to be ready early next morning to take Marfa away in the sledge. The poor girl was made to believe that she was going on a visit—a prospect which delighted her.

It was winter time, and very cold, and Morozko or Frost (a personage not unknown to English readers) had hung his glittering treasures all about.

After breakfast the wife gave the following explicit directions to her husband. 'Drive Marfa to her bridegroom, old man! And look here, old greybeard! drive straight along the road at first, and then turn off from the road on the right, you know, into the forest,

right up to the big pine that stands on the hill, and then hand Marfa over to Frost.'

The old man did not venture to disobey. So on reaching the tall pine-tree in the forest, he set down his daughter, bidding her to wait for the bridegroom, and receive him as pleasantly as she could, and then he drove home.

After Marfa had sat there shivering for some time, her teeth chattering with the cold, suddenly she heard a sound. It was Frost leaping from fir to fir, and snapping his fingers. Soon he was in the tree above her, and he called out, 'Art thou warm, maiden?' She replied, 'Warm, warm am I, dear Father Frost.' Descending lower he asked her again whether she was warm, and she replied as before, though she could scarcely draw her breath for the cold.

At last Frost took pity on her, and wrapped her in furs and blankets.

In the morning the father, coming to see after his daughter, was delighted to find her alive and loaded with costly gifts. But his wife was disappointed to see her return safe and sound. Punishment, however, came upon her. For, thinking to procure the like good fortune for her own daughters, she sent them off to the same spot, and they, out of temper with one another and with all the world, received Frost so ungraciously that he froze them to death.[1]

We have here considerably abridged Mr. Ralston's version of a popular Russian folk-tale. In its presentation of winter, the full effect of which naturally suffers in an abridgment, the story differs from most Northern tales. In lands where the horrors of winter are felt in all their stern reality, the imagination loves to dream of sunny scenes.

The story contains also what many folk-tales do not contain—a decidedly didactic element. It has a moral, or rather two or three morals, between whose conflicting claims to be *the* moral there is some difficulty in deciding. We could wish that Mr. Ralston had been able to add to his claim on our gratitude for the story itself by informing us whether it is considered to inculcate any one particular moral lesson, and what that lesson is. The demand for a moral to such a story does not seem satisfied by the point to which he calls attention, and which is illustrated in many popular stories of retributive justice, *viz.* that the murderous intention of the stepmother is punished (in the persons of her own daughters) by the same instrumentality as that on which she reckoned for effecting her criminal purpose. As no authoritative exposition of the parable is forthcoming, we confess to a doubt whether the *motif* is to illustrate the power of a patient and submissive disposition, or to represent unkindness

[1] See *Russian Folk-Tales*, pp. 214–220.

between near relations as more malignant than the severest natural forces. In a variation of the story, current in a different part of Russia, the pious submissiveness of the maiden, in this case not only to stern parental authority but to the Divine appointments, is brought into greater prominence. When left by her father, she sits 'trembling and silently offering up a prayer.' And it is her 'wise words' in reply to Frost, 'Welcome, Frost; doubtless God has sent you for my sinful soul,' that turn him into a friend.

Such questionings with regard to the moral apply to the story as it is told in modern times. There are scholars who would point to them, and to the fact that the didactic element is clearer in one variation than in another, in order to prove that this element is an afterthought, a later addition, showing the marks of its growth. If they are right, the story was perhaps in earlier days only a poetical rendering of the familiar fact that vegetation is preserved by the mantle of snow which is produced by, though it tempers the severity of, frost. On this interpretation the furs and blankets in the story represent the covering of snow by which the humbler herbage is protected, while a beautiful bridal veil, one of Frost's costly gifts, is the analogue of some other effect of cold, and the stepsisters would stand for the gay floral productions of the earth that perish on the approach of winter.

Such an interpretation is surely not wanting in grace. Yet to some minds it may appear an unwelcome degradation of moral tales to reduce them to mere descriptions of natural phenomena. The didactic element is first in importance, and, in their view, is generally the foundation of all such stories. They see the *raison d'être* of the narrative element in the fact that

> 'Truth in closest words shall fail
> When truth embodied in a tale
> Shall enter in at lowly doors.'

But, on either view, the marvel remains, and is equally significant, that the sensible world is thus capable of being the medium of conveying spiritual and moral truth. We refer, of course, to the fact that, apart from any miraculous interferences with the order of nature, the physical world contains multitudes of analogies to the moral and spiritual. It is immaterial, except as a question of science and one to be discussed on its own merits in each particular instance, whether the resemblance was first seen from the one side or the other. We cannot now pursue this line of thought further

than to remark that on either view the words of Archbishop Trench are equally true: 'Besides His revelation in words, God has another and an elder, and one indeed without which it is inconceivable how that other could be made; for from this it appropriates all its signs of communication.'

If it be true that art, in some of its chief departments, has well-nigh exhausted its resources, it is not true with regard to science. Amongst the older provinces of scientific inquiry some are still calling for new labourers, and promising great results to those who are willing to enlist in the service. For example, though so much has been already accomplished by the Egyptologists, yet a vast number of Egyptian texts remain undeciphered; while the history of the developments of Buddhism is so far from being an accomplished work that the labours of many scholars will be required, Dr. Rhys Davids tells us, for many years to come, only to prepare the materials for it.

Moreover, besides new fields which open from time to time to the view of advancing science, it happens occasionally that familiar ground, hitherto thought barren as regards scientific results, is found worthy of patient cultivation, which it rewards with a harvest of new truths and sometimes of new questions calling for further labour in their investigation. Thus it has come to pass that the mature intellect has turned to the serious investigation of some of the childish things which had been put away by advancing manhood, and science has not disdained to listen attentively to, and analyse, the old wives' fables which beguiled the long hours in the nursery, and to compare them with the marvellous narratives that serve a similar purpose in foreign lands.

Nor only the nursery tales. The narratives to which, under this denomination, most minds would recur, form only a small portion of the vast mass of popular literature known as folk-lore. We must not judge of the property of this kind possessed by other nations by that which may be found amongst ourselves. What may be the reason for the fact we will not take upon ourselves to determine; but, excepting in the limited store of nursery tales, the stream of folk-lore amongst the English peasantry has diminished to a very small volume. Like the taste for music which, in the times conveniently called (*pace* Mr. Freeman) Anglo-Saxon, was almost universal in this country, the capacity to be interested and amused by folk-tales has almost disappeared. Is it that the English have grown less imaginative, or less childish, or that literature of the 'penny dreadful' order has supplanted the

older food for imagination? Or is it that the folk-tale cannot really live without at least some lingering belief in its possible truth, and that credulity has disappeared before the march of education? Have the fairies and the ghouls and the genii gone the way of the graceful creations of the Greek intellect, and vanished along with all the 'fair humanities' of the ancient world, the nymph and the faun, and even Great Pan himself?

The comparative method is the order of the day in many branches of scientific study, and it has been productive of valuable results. In regard, indeed, to subjects admitting its application, the knowledge that is obtainable without it is but a very imperfect kind of knowledge. He who knows one language only may be truly said to have no scientific knowledge at all of language. A true insight into the nature of language is only to be obtained by comparing and contrasting several languages.

The method of comparison has elevated the fairy tale and all its relatives from the level of mere childish amusement to the rank of a scientific subject. So long as Jack the Giant-Killer or Cinderella or Puss in Boots were known only as belonging to the nursery literature of English homes, the scholar and the philosopher might well be excused for deeming them unworthy of serious attention. But one of the first discoveries of placing side by side the popular tales of divers countries is that many of the imaginary personages best known to the English child are heroes or heroines of almost world-wide celebrity. Even the differences in several versions of the same story current in different countries are often instructive. The local colouring is found to illustrate the character and the condition of the people amongst whom it is found.

The vitality of some portions of folk-lore is marvellous. And this remark applies not only to set histories, such as those of the personages just named, but even to pieces more trivial and apparently more fugitive. Is any one of our readers unacquainted with the refractory pig, to stimulate whose movements a whole series of causes and effects was required? The cumulative repetition exhibited in this story—a very ancient artifice in aid of memory, and one very freely employed in the sacred books of the Buddhists—helps no doubt to explain its continued transmission among English-speaking peoples. But its wide dissemination is extraordinary. Nor is it a peculiar possession of our own. In an Italian version which occurs to us the story is the same in the main, with one

chief exception. The machinery is much the same, and there is the same repetition, 'Water, water, quench fire! fire, fire, burn stick,' &c. The purpose, however, for which all the machinery is set in motion is to induce a refractory and ill-tempered boy to eat the portion of maccaroni which his mother has left for him.

The discovery of the wide dissemination of many folk-tales gives rise, as we have hinted already, to various questions, in answering which scholars are not agreed. How, for example, did the stories originate? What was their original meaning or intention? Were they devised as parables of life, the purpose of them being to convey wholesome instruction in a pleasant form? Or shall we say with some teachers that they grew up, without any such intention, out of the metaphorical language by which in the remote past the phenomena of nature were described? Was the tale of Cinderella, for instance, designed to show the hatefulness of superciliousness and the merit of humility and serviceableness, or does it only represent some one of the glorious transformations effected by nature in the physical world?

Again, how is the existence to be explained of a body of fable common to East and West? We have learnt that the language spoken by the ancestors of most European peoples and by the ancestors of ancient Indians and Persians was one and the same. Subject to modifications which follow well-ascertained laws, the words in most familiar use, such as father, mother, brother, son, daughter, the names of some domestic animals, the numerals from one to a hundred, and the roots of most words expressing action and even of those expressing quality, are identical in all the Indo-European languages. Some scholars are of opinion that the history of fable resembles that of language, and that the germ at least of many fables already existed before the Aryan or Indo-European tribes were separated. Another view, for which there is much to be said, is that the far East, and particularly India, was the nursery in which the fables were developed, and from whence they found their way by various channels to the western world. The advocates of this view point to such means of communication as pilgrims, merchants, crusaders, the Mohammedan conquerors of Spain, the Tartars of Russia.

That many fables have travelled we cannot doubt, but it is remarkable what a home-grown air some widely diffused stories have. Who did not hear in his younger days of the simpleton who on his way across country saw the Thames for the first time in his life, and patiently waited for all the water

to run away? Who did not fancy he knew the very county in which this rustic was born? Who was not surprised in his school days to find, on reading in his Horace

'Rusticus expectat dum defluat amnis,'

that the Roman poet was as familiar with the story as himself?

Some countries, however, are richer in folk-lore than others. Russia, for example, would appear to offer a congenial soil for it, a fact which is perhaps not surprising when we consider the difficulty of carrying out a general system of popular education amongst the sparsely scattered inhabitants of so vast a territory. Whatever the explanation, the folk-tale, according to Mr. Ralston, is characteristic of the Russian people. They, too, have preserved or developed a special aptitude for narrative in which other European Aryans are comparatively deficient. We are naturally more inclined to associate histrionic talent with the peoples of the south, but Mr. Ralston tells us that 'a taste for acting is widely spread in Russia and the Russian folk-tales are full of dramatic positions which offer a wide scope for a display of their reciters' mimetic talents.' The narratives themselves are remarkable likewise for their simple directness and the excellence of their descriptive portions. We commenced this paper with a story which, more especially in the unabridged form, exhibits these qualities in a high degree. In the following story, which Mr. Ralston considers one of the best folk-tales he knows, the same qualities are seen in the presentation of supernatural effects. The Baba Yaga that figures in it is one of the chief of the malignant powers that belong to the world of Russian folk-lore. Were it not that our modern associations with the word 'witch' render it too feeble a title, and moreover that Russian folk-lore boasts of another female being to whom the title more strictly belongs, who, however, closely resembles the Baba Yaga in disposition and in behaviour, so much so that their parts are interchanged in various versions of the same stories, we should be disposed to call her The Witch. Since Shakespeare's time, however, this word has been too generally employed to denote certain withered specimens of helpless humanity who in remote villages have been objects and sometimes subjects of superstition.[1]

[1] The 'witch,' the 'white witch,' and the 'cunning man,' have not yet entirely disappeared from England. Many a west-country clergyman could tell strange tales in illustration of such lingering superstitions.

The story is too long to be given here in full. We will however endeavour to give the reader as fair a taste of its quality as condensation and occasional quotation will allow.

Vasilissa the Fair, like the heroine of our first story and of so many others, is condemned to live with a spiteful stepmother and her two daughters. The latter were not even her half-sisters. For his second wife her father had chosen a widow with two daughters of her own, just about the same age as Vasilissa, thinking that 'she must needs be both a good housekeeper and an experienced mother. But he had deceived himself, for he did not find in her a kind mother for his Vasilissa.'

We pause to remark that in many tales which have travelled in Christian times to the West from countries where polygamy was practised, the stepmother stands in the modern version for the elder and jealous wife who hates the offspring of her rival.[1]

Vasilissa's stepmother and stepsisters were jealous of her beauty, and 'tormented her with every possible sort of toil in order that she might grow thin from overwork and be tanned by the sun and the wind. But she bore everything with resignation' and, wonderful to say, continued to increase in beauty, while her enemies grew plainer and plainer 'from the effects of their own spite, notwithstanding that they always sat with folded hands like ladies.'

'But how did that come about? Why, it was her doll that helped Vasilissa. If it hadn't been for it, however could the girl have got through all her work?'

A word of explanation is necessary here. Dolls or puppets figure, as Mr. Ralston remarks, in various folk-tales. That in the present story has a very marked character, and the simplest explanation of it appears to us to be that it represents religion, or rather the outward embodiment of some object of devotion. The better side of image-worship, that which is alleged in its palliation or justification, is that it assists devotion. But it is easy to see how thoughts, whether consolatory, stimulating, self-reproachful, or otherwise, which arise in the mind when contemplating a sacred image, should be attributed to suggestion on the part of the image itself. The reader is now furnished, we believe, with a key to the story so far as the character and conduct of the heroine is concerned. Much that remains may probably be resolved into a nature-myth, as we shall see later on. But to proceed with the story:—

On her dying bed the mother of Vasilissa, who was then eight years old, had given her this doll, saying 'Listen, Vasilissa dear,

[1] See *Russian Folk-Tales*, p. 82.

remember and obey these last words of mine. I am going to die. And now, together with my parental blessing, I bequeath to you this doll. Keep it always by you, and never show it to anybody ; and whenever any misfortune comes upon you, give the doll food, and ask its advice. When it has fed it will tell you a cure for your troubles.'

In all her troubles Vasilissa had recourse to her doll, which never failed to give her good advice and comfort her in her sorrow. Moreover, it did all her work for her, and even showed her herbs which prevented her from getting sunburnt.

When Vasilissa was grown up she received many offers of marriage, while none came to her stepsisters. This made her stepmother more savage than before. She repulsed the suitors and beat poor Vasilissa.

It happened that Vasilissa's father, who was a merchant, had to go away from home on business for a long time. Thereupon the family removed to a house which stood near a dense forest, in the heart of which was a clearing where was a hut inhabited by a Baba Yaga.

One night Vasilissa was compelled by her cruel relations to start off for the Baba Yaga's to ask for a light. Before starting she went into her little closet, set before the doll a supper which she had provided beforehand, and said 'Now, dolly, feed, and listen to my need! I'm sent to the Baba Yaga's for a light. The Baba Yaga will eat me!'

The doll fed, and its eyes began to glow just like a couple of candles. 'Never fear, Vasilissa dear!' it said. 'Go where you're sent ; only take care to keep me always by you. As long as I'm with you, no harm will come to you at the Baba Yaga's.'

So Vasilissa got ready, put her doll in her pocket, crossed herself, and went out into the thick forest.

As she walks she trembles. Suddenly a horseman gallops by. He is white, and he is dressed in white, under him is a white horse, and the trappings of the horse are white—and the day begins to break.

She goes a little further, and a second rider gallops by. He is red, dressed in red, and sitting on a red horse—and the sun rises.

Vasilissa went on walking all night and all next day. It was only towards the evening that she reached the clearing on which stood the dwelling of the Baba Yaga. The fence around it was made of dead men's bones ; on the top of the fence were stuck human skulls with eyes in them ; instead of uprights at the gates were men's legs ; instead of bolts were arms ; instead of a lock was a mouth with sharp teeth.

Vasilissa was frightened out of her wits and stood still as if rooted to the ground.

Suddenly there rode past another horseman. He was dressed all in black and on a black horse. He galloped up to the Baba Yaga's gate and disappeared, and night fell. But the darkness did not last long. The eyes of all the skulls on the fence began to shine, and the whole clearing became bright. Vasilissa shuddered with fear, but stopped where she was, not knowing which way to run.

Soon there was heard in the forest a terrible roar. The trees cracked, the dry leaves rustled. Out of the forest came the Baba Yaga, riding in a mortar, urging it on with a pestle, sweeping away her traces with a broom.

The remainder of the story must be given in as few words as possible. The Baba Yaga takes Vasilissa within, promising that if she will stay awhile and do some work she will give her a light, but threatening to eat her if she does not do so. The task set to be done during the absence of the Baba Yaga on the following day is to clear of the seed four quarters of wheat, and to cleanse the courtyard, sweep the room, cook the dinner, and get the linen ready. The Baba Yaga consumed an enormous supper, leaving a few scraps for Vasilissa, and then went to sleep. Not in vain did the girl have recourse to her invaluable monitor, which soothed her fears with the words, 'Never fear, Vasilissa dear! Sup, say your prayers, and go to bed; the morning is wiser than the evening.' In the morning as she looked out of the window the light in the skulls' eyes went out, the white horseman appeared, daylight returned, the Baba Yaga started forth in her strange conveyance, and, the red horseman having appeared, the sun rose.

It is scarcely necessary to say that Vasilissa's task was satisfactorily accomplished before the return of the Yaga. A harder task was set for the next day, but there was no opportunity for the task-mistress to complain when she returned. Vasilissa, being encouraged to speak, ventured to ask about the horsemen whom she had seen, and learnt that they were all the Yaga's trusty servants. Her inquisitiveness extended no further, which was fortunate: 'As to over-inquisitive people,' said the Yaga, 'I eat them.'

Vasilissa's captivity was soon ended. The Yaga drove her out of the house on learning that she was enabled to get through all her task-work because she was assisted 'by her mother's blessing.' Finding her way home by the light of one of the skulls, she was warmly received by her stepmother and stepsisters, who had been entirely destitute of light during her absence. But they were burnt up by the flames that shone forth from the skull.

The conclusion of the story relates how, by the aid of the doll, Vasilissa was enabled to produce needlework of such extraordinary excellence that the king sent for her, and was so struck by her beauty that he made her his wife.[1]

What is the meaning of this story? Some readers may be disposed to thrust it aside as meaningless, as mere childish nonsense; but it appears to us to contain much good sense and some deep if mistaken philosophy. The Baba Yaga may well stand for Nature personified, the actual malignity of her character being doubtless due to the influence of Eastern philosophy. It is, however, to be noted that, harsh and cruel as she appears, hard as are the tasks which she

[1] See *Russian Folk-Tales*, pp. 150–158.

exacts, she is harmless to those who possess a certain inner spring of wisdom. Patience, perseverance, and devotion to duty are enabled by supernatural help to surmount difficulties which are apparently insuperable.

That Nature herself is represented by the Baba Yaga seems evident. Who but Nature could be supposed to have the Day, the Sun, and the Night for her 'trusty servants'? Why she should ride in a mortar and sweep away her traces is not indeed quite clear; but there is nothing incongruous in the poetical representation of her as a being who goes abroad at dawn and seeks repose at night, or as a powerful being who destroys the idle and those who are rashly inquisitive, while she grants, if grudgingly, the means of subsistence to the industrious.

One curious result of the modern investigation into the sources of popular tales is to deprive an ancient name of those honours of authorship which during many centuries caused its possessor to be regarded as the type of the fabulist. The world, both ancient and modern, has been familiar with fables which were supposed to have sprung from the inventive genius of Æsop, who is said to have lived in the sixth century before Christ. If he left any writings behind him they are not now extant. Whether the fables, the turning of which into verse beguiled the tedium of Socrates' imprisonment, were Æsop's, as Plato asserted, we have no means of knowing; but the so-called fables of Æsop current in the modern world are none of them really Æsopean at all. They all come to us directly either from the collection of fables formed by Planudes, a monk of Constantinople of the fourteenth century, or from still more recent supplementary collections. Planudes was indebted for several of his fables to Babrius, a Greek versifier of the first century before Christ, whose work was also the basis of the collection of fables which Phædrus, the freedman of Augustus, published with respectful mention of Æsop as their original author. The work of Babrius had been lost sight of for a long while, only a few fragments of it being known in the Middle Ages; but in 1824 a complete copy was found in the possession of the monks on Mount Athos. Before the time of Planudes many of the Buddhist Birth Stories and other Indian tales were already well known in Europe, and to this source he was largely indebted. It appears even that some fables which are found, not only in Planudes, but also in Phædrus and in Babrius, are of Buddhist origin.

The reduction of such a literary personality as that of

Æsop to a mere *magni nominis umbra* is a remarkable achievement. Not less striking is the proof, apparently irrefutable, of the identity of a canonized saint, whose title to the honour has received the formal recognition of the Papacy, with Gotama the Buddha. Professor Liebrecht had identified Josaphat, the hero of a mediæval religious romance, with Buddha; but it was Professor Max Müller who first pointed out the fact that the founder of Buddhism is represented in the Roman Calendar, though in many of the numerous works based on the story of Josaphat the hero is stated to have been canonized. Dr. Rhys Davids has furnished some additional and important details on the subject.

In the *Martyrologium*, compiled by Cardinal Baronius and authorized by Pope Sixtus V. (1585–1590), are included, under the date of November 27, 'the holy Saints Barlaam and Josaphat, of India, on the borders of Persia, whose wonderful acts Saint John of Damascus has described.'[1] Baronius derived the names from the *Catalogus Sanctorum* drawn up in the fourteenth century by Petrus de Natalibus, who borrowed his account of the two saints from a Latin version of a work in Greek by S. John of Damascus. This work was the romance just mentioned in which the author has made use of materials drawn from the life of Buddha to construct the history of Joasaph or Josaphat, whom he presents to the reader as an Indian prince converted by Barlaam and renouncing the world to become a hermit. Not only are there correspondences between the two lives in regard to various details, but the name Josaphat is proved by comparative philology to be merely a corruption of the word Bodisat, the title borne by Buddha in the *Birth Stories*.[2] Moreover, in the romance many of the fables and other narratives contained in the book of *Birth Stories* reappear.

But how did S. John of Damascus become acquainted with this Indian literature? The answer is plain. In his earlier days he held high office under the Khalif of Bagdad, at whose court was produced the Arabic version, entitled *Kalilah and Dimnah*, of a work in Ancient Persian, the materials of which were derived from a Buddhistic source.

The romance of Barlaam and Josaphat was composed in

[1] Dr. Rhys Davids gives the reference to 'p. 177 of the edition of 1873, bearing the official approval of Pope Pius IX.'—See *Buddhist Birth Stories* (Translation), vol i. Introduction.

[2] These stories purport to relate incidents in Buddha's past lives when he was only on the road to Buddhahood, a Bodisat, or 'one who is about to become a Buddha.'

the eighth century, and its popularity and extensive circulation are shown by the fact that it exists in Latin, French, Italian, Spanish, German, English, Swedish, Dutch, and Icelandic. It is not surprising that if the story was supposed to have a foundation in fact, the idea of venerating the central figures of it, whenever or wherever that idea may have first suggested itself, should have met with wide popular approval.

The latest important addition to the accumulating stores of folk-lore comes to us from the far east. It does not, however, come directly, Mr. Ralston's *Tibetan Tales* being a translation by him of the German version by the lately deceased great Russian linguist Professor Schiefner of the legends and tales contained in one portion of the sacred canon of Tibet. Nor are the tales indigenous to that country. In common with the main body of that colossal code, consisting of over three hundred folio volumes, they are merely Tibetan versions of Sanskrit writings. It may be, as Mr. Ralston says, that stories possessing characteristic features and suffused with local colour still possibly live in the memories of the natives of that region of lofty and bleak tablelands, with which so few Europeans have had an opportunity of becoming familiar.[1] But these tales are not of that character. They contain no allusion to those striking peculiarities of Tibetan Buddhism, the 'Praying Wheels' and the 'Trees of the Law,' which are supposed to serve the purpose of devotion while they dispense with the trouble of it,[2] or to that Lamaism which, even by the confession of Roman ecclesiastics, bears so much resemblance externally to Romanism.

Of the stories before us many are fables about animals, and these as well as some other short narratives have their counterparts in European folk-lore. Some are more properly legends, and these have little more than occasional features in

[1] *Tibetan Tales*, Introduction.

[2] An ingenious device for economizing time which is practised by the Mongol Buriates of Russia deserves mention. According to M. Vasilief they are even more devoted to their religion than their kinsmen in Mongolia itself. 'They read their sacred books, or hear them read, in Tibetan, and are edified, even though they do not comprehend. Anyone who wishes to command a reading . . . addresses himself to one of the monasteries, . . . pays a certain price, and provides tea for the Lamas.' A reading of the *Kah-gyur*, which consists of above one hundred volumes, used to cost about fifteen pounds, exclusive of tea. 'At a given signal all the Lamas flock together, and take their places according to seniority. Before each are placed a number of leaves of the work, and off they set, all reading at once, so that the entire performance occupies only a few hours.'—*Tibetan Tales*, Introduction.

common with tales current in the West. They will doubtles be useful as illustrating one of the developments of Buddhism, but they are not so diverting as the Russian tales, and their moral teaching is by no means uniformly good. They are, however, not wanting in inventiveness. The story, for example, of 'Prince Jivaka, King of the Physicians,' contains several ingeniously devised illustrations of the remarkable astuteness of that personage, though here and there some resemblances may be found elsewhere to the disorders or to the method of cure of which the legend treats. When a man is tormented by pains in the ear in consequence of a centipede having crept in and therein given birth to seven hundred young ones, perhaps no easier cure can be devised than that by which Jivaka earned the gratitude of a patient thus afflicted.

'He said to the man, "Go and make a hut out of foliage, carpet it with blue stuff, place a drum underneath, and make the ground warm." The man provided everything as he was told. Then Jivaka made the man lie down, sprinkled the ground with water, and beat the drum. Thereupon the centipede, thinking that the summer was come, crept out. Then Jivaka placed a piece of meat on the ear. The reptile turned back, but presently came out again with its young ones, and they all laid hold of the piece of meat. Whereupon Jivaka flung it into the flesh pot, and the man recovered his health.'[1]

This method of cure was a decided improvement upon that which Jivaka had seen his instructor employ in a case of cerebral malady arising from a similar cause, and which required as a preliminary that the skull of the patient should be laid open. Inasmuch, too, as the operation was painless, and left no ill effects, it certainly is to be preferred to that which is related of a certain English country clergyman, who, it is said, could obtain no rest from headaches, till at last he induced the village blacksmith to hit him on the head with his largest hammer. The patient's skull cracked beneath the blow, and out came sufficient swarms of earwigs to account for his complaint. This story, however, as Mr. Ralston remarks, requires verification.[2] But Jivaka, as appears from the account of another cure effected by him, could perform a surgical operation on the head without inflicting any pain upon the patient, without even the consciousness on his part that the operation was being performed. We are not informed how the anæsthesia was induced, unless the five hundred jugs of water poured on to the seat of the disorder, both before and after the appli-

[1] See *Tibetan Tales*, p. 103.
[2] See *Tibetan Tales*, Introduction.

cation of the surgical instrument, may be held sufficient to account for any amount of insensibility. Seriously, it is interesting to observe how literally modern science, by the discovery of the beneficent action of anæsthetics, has realized one of the wildest dreams of the ancient world. When in the story the patient, after the operation was all over, called upon the physician to begin his work, he actually anticipated a frequent experience of modern times.

The last of the anecdotes told of Jivaka bears some resemblance, not indeed as to detail, but in regard to the leading idea of the method of cure, to stories current elsewhere. The idea is that of a patient being roused somehow or another into a tremendous rage, and in consequence making some violent exertion which proves beneficial to him. In the story before us the invalid, who is no less a personage than the king himself, is suffering from an internal tumour. Jivaka, being charged with its removal, reflects that either excessive joy or excessive wrath might disperse it. He concludes that it is necessary at all risks to excite in his patient excessive wrath, because—the words are very remarkable—'it would be impossible to arouse excessive joy within so sinful a man.' Accordingly he devises the means of inflaming the king's rage, and a perfect cure is the result.[1]

We cannot close this paper without a word of admiration for the self-sacrificing life of the scholar whose labours opened the way to the acquisition by Western scholars of the Tibetan language, previously thought, as Dr. Malan says, almost mythical. The story of Csoma de Körös deserves to rank with those of the great discoverers. His self-devotion, his patience, his power of endurance, and his death as a martyr to the cause of knowledge will bear comparison with those of Livingstone.

A native of Hungary, born about 1790, he set himself, under the influence of a philological error, to the task, now known to be impossible, of discovering the ancient home of his ancestors in Eastern Asia. There he expected to find, says Professor Arminius Vámbéry, a people speaking his own language and closely connected with his own nation. 'Where are you going?' De Körös was asked at the outset of his travels, by a fellow-countryman whose house he was passing, 'clad in a thin yellow nankin dress, with a stick in his hand, and a small bundle.' 'I am going to Asia in search of our relatives,' was the reply. 'And thus,' continues the Professor, 'he really went, undergoing, as may easily be conceived, all

[1] See *Tibetan Tales*, p. 107 *seq.*

the hardships and privations of a traveller destitute of means, living upon alms, and exposed besides to the bitter deception of not having found the looked-for relatives.'

De Körös started on his travels New Year's Day 1820, and he died at Darjeeling, in Nepal, April 11, 1842. A considerable portion of the interval between 1820 and 1832 was spent by him in studying, with the aid of a Lama, the Tibetan literature in the monasteries of that country, living in the poorest possible manner. He left no record of his sojourn in the monasteries, but the glimpses afforded of his life will give some idea of his patience and devotion. At one time, the thermometer being below zero for more than four months, he was confined by the severity of the weather to a room nine feet square. Yet he managed to read from morning to evening without a fire, and 'collected and arranged forty thousand words in the language of Tibet, and nearly completed his Dictionary and Grammar.' These works were brought out at Calcutta, where several of the following years were spent, and where he held for a time the post of assistant-librarian to the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

But what had become of his original purpose? Though he never relinquished the hope of one day penetrating to the ancient ancestral home which he believed to be on the northern confines of China, it would seem that on finding an important and practical work—that of opening up the way into the mysteries of Tibetan literature—offered to his hand, he bent his energies to this, while reserving the other as a future triumph. It was with the hope of making new and great discoveries of Tibetan literature that he left Calcutta in 1842 with the view of revisiting Tibet and making his way further east. This hope was never realized. He was attacked by fever on April 6, and died within a week, a victim, as Professor Max Müller has said, 'to his heroic devotion to the study of ancient languages and religions.' A monument was erected above his remains by the Asiatic Society of Bengal, and his grave has since been placed by the Indian Government under the care for ever of the British Resident for the time being at Darjeeling.[1]

[1] See *Tibetan Tales*, Introduction.

ART. IV.—DR. FARRAR'S 'EARLY DAYS OF CHRISTIANITY.'

The Early Days of Christianity. By F. W. FARRAR, D.D., Canon of Westminster, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. 2 vols. (London, 1882.)

WHEN the ecclesiastical history of the last quarter of a century comes to be written it will, we suppose, be characterized as a period singularly defective in works of dogmatic theology and even polemic or partisan treatises of permanent weight and moment, while it has been singularly fertile in books dealing with the text and exegesis of Holy Scripture and Christian evidences. Not that our own times have been wanting in stirring debates and even great and momentous epochs. On the Continent the historian will chronicle the supreme crisis of the Vatican Council, from which it is not too much to say that a new period of Church history must be dated. The Protestant communions of France and Germany have been disturbed by internal dissensions of no slight moment; while the Church of England has experienced continued attacks from political dissent outside, has been weakened by frequent small defections Romewards, especially among certain classes of her children, and has been disturbed within by party controversies rivalling in the anxiety that they have caused, if not in the bitterness of their personal animosity, any that have previously strained the union of her members. But, strange to say, neither in Italy, in France, in Germany, or in England have these discussions and disturbances produced a solid mass of argument to rival the great works of former days. No Bellarmine or Bossuet, no Luther or Calvin, no Hooker or Pearson, has appeared in the Church. It may be said that life moves nowadays too rapidly; that the pamphlet, the newspaper or review, the apologetic lecture, the occasional sermon, are more fitted to our time. But this is only half an explanation. No doubt popular taste encourages a great deal of fugitive writing. But in former days those who wrote for the moment could also produce a powerful and consistent body of thought. Nay, this is perhaps particularly true of those who in our own day have composed works of permanent value. To speak of those who have been recently taken from us: writing pamphlets, tracts, or

reviews did not hinder men like Dr. Pusey and Dr. Mozley from the composition of books that will endure the test of time. But they, too, seem to us exceptions that prove the rule. Even men of such astonishing learning and activity of mind as Dr. Pusey, of such acute and broad intelligence as Dr. Mozley, have failed to produce first-rate books of dogmatic theology or even polemics. The *Eirenicon*, though polemic enough to be likened by its recipient to an olive-branch shot from a catapult, was not polemic in intention; and its author recoiled from the task which the Vatican Decrees seemed to throw upon him. Dr. Pusey, if we mistake not, will live as an author rather in his Sermons, his Commentary on the Minor Prophets, and his Lectures on Daniel, than in his more purely dogmatic or controversial treatises. Dr. Mozley was confessedly an apologist, and, as such, will rank very high among English theologians. Even his books on Predestination and on Baptism, his most purely dogmatic works, are, to a great extent, an apology for Augustinianism, adapted to meet the stress of a particular controversy. The same thing is true of living writers, such as Dr. Liddon and Dr. Westcott, whose most valuable books, outside the field of exegesis and criticism—the *Divinity of Christ* and the *Gospel of the Resurrection*—are both apologetic in their character.

But if we admit the absence of works profoundly and primarily dogmatic, no one can doubt the great fertility of exegetical and critical literature, especially in England and Germany. To speak only of our own writers in the Church of England, the present generation has seen the completion of two commentaries on the whole Bible—those of Bishop Wordsworth, and the 'Speaker's,' edited by Canon Cook; of two on the whole New Testament—Dean Alford's and that edited by Bishop Ellicott; of special commentaries and textual criticisms by such various writers as Pusey, Lightfoot, Stanley, Jowett, Ellicott, Burgon, Scrivener, Kay, Perowne, Vaughan, Plumptre, Cheyne, Sanday, and a host of others. It has seen the text of Westcott and Hort brought to publication and its principles elaborately explained, a text which has, *at least*, the great merits of being based upon a full consideration of the accessible evidence and upon critical principles attained and tested by unwearied study. Above all, it has seen the completion of the Revised Version of the New Testament, which has sold by tens of thousands in all English-speaking lands; and it awaits, at no distant date, the even more important revision of the Old Testament.

Of the writers who have thus given themselves to the study and criticism of the New Testament, Dr. Farrar is not one of the least important. The mere bulk and popularity of his work is a fact of no slight mark. Six thick octavo volumes, containing about 600 pages apiece, have been published by him during the last eight years, entirely upon the New Testament. The *Life of Christ* was published first in 1874, and went through twenty-four editions in two years; it is now in the twenty-ninth edition in its original shape and has appeared in two other more popular forms at a cheaper price. The *Life and Work of St. Paul* was issued first in 1879, and is already in its 19th thousand, besides appearing as a popular serial. The preface to the *Early Days of Christianity* is dated June 7, 1882. By Christmas 1882 it had reached its eighth thousand.

This is a phenomenon to excite attention: it is one, in some respects, almost unique in the world of books, and it is perhaps specially deserving of remark in our own age. Dr. Farrar is no doubt a very eloquent and generally a very perspicuous writer, but he does not spare learning either in his text or his notes. The reader has to familiarize himself with a number of strange words and thoughts, and to make what he can of a great variety of sometimes rather enigmatic quotations and allusions. Nor does he, on the other hand, appeal largely to those destructive tendencies which are supposed to be just now so popular. Setting aside the recurrence of certain commonplaces of reproof and censure—which we could readily spare—and the prominence given to one or two opinions alien from the general mind of Christendom, Dr. Farrar's attitude is practical and conservative rather than critical and negative. He discusses points of debate largely and diffusely; but it is to prove a definite conclusion rather than to leave the reader in uncertainty, and the balance of the conclusion is generally on the conservative side. Dr. Farrar's success then gives us a valuable insight into the general mind of the English reading public, and particularly, we suppose, of the great middle class. We find them ready to read with eagerness anything that makes the New Testament more real to them, not deterred by the size and price of the books which are offered to them, but apparently sincerely anxious to have a complete idea of what the canonical Scriptures have to teach in the language of the present day. Whatever faults we may find with the details or principles of Dr. Farrar's work, he has done a real service to the Church of England by proving this fact so triumphantly.

He has shown that our countrymen beyond the men and women of other nations still love the Bible, and will read it and read about it with an assiduity and zeal that they bestow upon few other books. We say read 'it' as well as 'about it,' because Dr. Farrar's books are largely made up of translations more or less literal from the actual Greek of the New Testament.

This is the first remark that occurs to us on the completion of Dr. Farrar's trilogy. But what shall we say of the character and influence of his teaching? Here we think that there is some disposition amongst critics and critical scholars to undervalue the work that he has done. His faults are just those that offend old-fashioned scholarly orthodoxy and progressive freedom of thought, almost in equal measure. He has well-known and obvious defects of style; he is often redundant in language, profuse in illustration, annoyingly obscure in allusion; he is sometimes over-positive and opinionated on uncertain topics; he is sometimes too vacillating where a positive opinion would be more expedient; he now and then criticizes with some fervour the misdeeds of a particular school or set of interpreters, and at the end offers a solution scarcely distinguishable from that which he has generally censured. He takes advantage of popular prejudice against dogmatism, or whatever it may be, and then becomes dogmatic.

We fear that these defects, together with a certain overswiftness of execution, and a certain lack of depth and penetration in his theology, will prevent Dr. Farrar's books from retaining the popularity which they have so rapidly acquired. He has not the genius or the inspiration—perhaps no one can have—to recombine the fragments of apostolic preaching, the 'broken pieces' from their separate baskets, into the original loaf which was blessed in the hand of Christ; or, to use another metaphor, Dr. Farrar has a certain many-coloured prismatic brilliancy, he delights us with a variety of broken lights, but he wants the severe concentration of the white and pure light of theology which enables us to see things as they really are. If not exactly 'infelix operis summa,' we feel that he leaves us with a sense of incompleteness; that we want some elements, and, above all, a concentration of those which are put before us; and that another generation will feel the want even more than we do. But we believe that these books, especially perhaps the volumes now before us, will render in the main excellent service, and service which it seems no other writer is able to offer in the same attractive form.

Critics do not always remember that the value of books differs very much according to their subject-matter. What would be dangerous in a book of dogmatics or polemics is comparatively harmless in a book of literary exegesis and history. In reading the latter we are quite satisfied that the author should differ from us (within certain limits) in his theories and hypotheses. He must adopt the way of putting and viewing things which is natural to him, or he could not hold his facts together; and we cannot expect this way to commend itself always to our taste or judgment. But what we look for mainly in books of exegesis and historical theology is a good mass of facts appropriately presented—things new and old picked out of the stores and suggestions of the 'scribes,' and so arranged as to impress the memory. Truth on these matters is not only very difficult to attain, but requires long time and a gradual process for its appropriation. There is a growth and a continuity in learning, as in other things, which advances by slow degrees, and very seldom by rapid bounds. We must not then be discontented with incompleteness and transitional knowledge. The facts which to us seem heterogeneous and confused are nevertheless worth acquiring by our generation, because they will be the foundation for the more lucid convictions of those who come after us. We may have little idea of the final shape of those convictions, but underground labour in teaching and learning is nevertheless very essential to their ripeness and solidity. The truth at last acquired is not really new, much less discordant from the old truths, but it is alive and growing, not shut up within the barriers in which any one generation has enclosed it. And it is one of the noblest prerogatives of Holy Scripture to be thus relatively new to every age. It is always capable of being put in fresh lights, of yielding fresh instruction to each student who approaches it with reverence and purity of intention. If therefore Dr. Farrar has, as we think, put into the hands of a large class of persons, almost untouched before, a mass of trustworthy facts about the New Testament, and put them in the way to become for the first time matter of general knowledge, he has done a great service to the cause of religious education and divine truth, even though the form of his work may not be absolutely permanent.

The danger of course is, that in bringing down these facts to the level of common intelligence an author may tend to vulgarize religion, or at least to remove the sense of mystery and reverence which ought to lie close about it. This is, we think, a very real danger. It was this that spoiled and

degraded the work of the early Franciscans, who began so hopefully, and performed the inestimable service of bringing back to the ordinary men and women of their day the real apprehension of Christ's manhood, and of the home life of Bethlehem and Nazareth. A certain personal self-satisfaction, a feeling of knowing all that can be known, of being as it were behind the scenes with Divine Providence, creeps naturally and fatally over popular religionists.

Dr. Farrar has shown that he is fully alive to this danger of vulgarization in a recent and powerful sermon on the Salvation Army. He has also, we believe, revealed it by the marked respect with which he received the criticism of Dr. Pusey, whose almost Judaic sense of the reality and simple certainty of the Divine revelation was accompanied by an almost apostolic feeling of the awfulness of Christian responsibility and of the mystery surrounding the Creed.

The writer of the *Life of Christ* did indeed seem to us when we first read his book to be in some danger of so representing the humanity of Our Saviour in such clear and distinct outlines, with so little shade and reserve, as to lead his less cautious readers into something like the condition of the men of Nazareth, who, knowing the outside look and circumstances of the life of Jesus, presumed to think that they knew all about Him. We believe, however, that we can trace a change in the last book; we perceive, if we may venture to say so, a deepened sense of the mystery of Holy Scripture, and of the reverence due to the opinion of the Church.

It is time now to speak of the book before us rather more in detail. The subject treated in it is not so much the early days of Christianity in general, as the matter and surroundings of the Catholic Epistles, the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse. But it contains so much general history that the title is not a misnomer. It is divided into five books, headed respectively: (1) The World; (2) S. Peter and the Church Catholic; (3) Apollos, Alexandrian Christianity and the Epistle to the Hebrews; (4) Judaic Christianity; (5) The Earlier Life and Works of S. John.

The first book consists of four very brilliant chapters on the degeneracy of Paganism and the life and reign of Nero. These are chapters which the reader will hurry through almost without taking breath. It is a period which has been often and well described before; but, considering the chapters as a popular sketch giving a vivid and incisive presentation of perhaps the darkest age of Roman history, we do not know where to turn for a better one. The scenes, especially of the

life of Agrippina, the murders of Claudius and Britannicus, her own death, and the death of Nero, though well known to classical scholars, become public property in a book like this in quite a new sense. The reader gets a haunting, sickening perception of a time of depravity and terror, which is perhaps the best preparation for appreciating the divine peace and purity of Christian morals. We are sincerely grateful to Dr. Farrar for bringing the two into such close and telling juxtaposition. The writer of *Seekers after God* can hardly be supposed wanting in sympathy with what was good in Stoicism or any other form of Pagan virtue. Yet he is one of the sternest painters of the decadence and hopelessness of the period in which the Gospel first shone upon the Roman world. The following passage is not quite Dr. Farrar's best, but it puts the contrast most effectively. Nero having tried to murder his mother Agrippina, who had raised him to power by her crimes, and was ever after treated by him with black ingratitude, has just heard of her almost miraculous escape. He is filled with alarm at the prospect of what she may do in her thirst for vengeance (i. p. 45) :—

'Burrus and Seneca were hastily summoned. To them the Emperor appealed in the extreme agitation of unsuccessful guilt. In silence and anguish the soldier and the Stoic felt, as they listened to the tale, how fatal to their reputation was their prosperous complicity with the secrets of such a court. Seneca was the first to break the silence. He asked his colleague "whether the Prætorians should be ordered to put her to death." In that hour he must have tasted the very dregs of the bitter cup of moral degradation. Perhaps the two ministers excused themselves with the sophism that things had now gone too far to prevent the commission of a crime, and that either Agrippina or Nero must perish. But Burrus replied that "the Prætorians would never lift a hand against the daughter of their beloved Germanicus. Let Anicetus fulfil his promise." Miserable soldier! Miserable philosopher! Stoicism has been often exalted at the expense of Christianity. Let the world remember the two scenes, in one of which the polished Stoic, in the other the Christian Apostle stood; the one a magnificent minister, the other a fettered prisoner—in the presence of the Lord of the world.'[1]

[1] In the last sentence it will be seen that Dr. Farrar assumes the actual trial of S. Paul before Nero, and we think with good reason. A few pages later, however, it is spoken of less absolutely: 'S. Paul in all probability had recently stood before his tribunal' (p. 62). In the *Life and Work of S. Paul*, ii. p. 553, we read 'it is not impossible.' There is a want of perfect workmanship here, which is one of the blemishes of the book. The repetition of the same word in two succeeding sentences is also rather a common weakness in these last volumes, and is, we fear, the sign of strength somewhat overtaxed. We have also marked several

Dr. Farrar naturally dwells at some length on the burning of Rome and the punishment of the Christians who were falsely accused of having caused it, and so first brought into public prominence in the capital of the world. He inclines to connect Nero himself with the conflagration, or at least puts the reports against him in the text, and the evidence in his favour in a note (p. 52). The calumnies against the Christians he attributes to the influence of the Empress Poppæa and the pantomimist Aliturus, both apparently Jewish proselytes, and both having great power over Nero (p. 62 foll.) We believe that M. Renan was the first person in our own day to make this suggestion, which is in itself very probable; but Dr. Farrar does not refer it to him. Perhaps it may be a coincidence, perhaps an older conjecture; in any case it gives a very natural explanation of what is otherwise somewhat obscure. The following description of some of the horrors of the first great persecution will appeal forcibly to the imagination of every one who has visited Rome, and indeed of every one who reads it (i. p. 68) :—

'Imagine that awful scene once witnessed by the silent obelisk in the square before S. Peter's at Rome! Imagine it, that we may realize how vast is the change which Christianity has wrought in the feelings of mankind! There, where the vast dome now rises, were once the gardens of Nero. They were thronged with gay crowds, among whom the Emperor moved in his frivolous degradation, and on every side were men dying slowly on their cross of shame. Along the paths of those gardens on the autumn nights were ghastly torches blackening the ground between them with streams of sulphurous pitch, and each of those living torches was a martyr in his shirt of fire. And in the amphitheatre hard by, in sight of twenty thousand spectators, famished dogs were tearing to pieces some of the best and purest of men and women, hideously disguised in the skins of bears or wolves. Thus did Nero baptize in the blood of martyrs the city which was to be for ages the capital of the world.'

Then follow some telling remarks about the terrible æsthetic realism which then prevailed, and which always threatens to assert itself again as morality decays, and when Art, the handmaid, is exalted to the throne which belongs to her mistress Virtue. 'Comedy must be actual shame, and tragedy genuine bloodshed. When the play of Afranius, called "The Conflagration," was put on the stage, a house must be really burnt and its furniture really plundered. In

places where the notes do not contain the references to passages quoted or referred to in the text, which we really want to verify, but a number of references of unequal value rather hurriedly massed together.

the mime called "Laureolus" an actor must really be crucified and mangled by a bear, and really fling himself down and deluge the stage with blood' (p. 69). To this class of exhibitions Dr. Farrar (p. 71) refers the strange expression of the First Epistle of S. Clement (c. vi.), where he speaks of 'women, Danaids, and Dirces' suffering cruel and unholy insults and safely reaching the goal in the race of faith, just after he has described the martyrdoms of S. Peter and S. Paul, and those of the 'vast multitude' of the elect who were gathered together in their company. This is the opinion of many commentators, including Hefele and Renan; but we think that Bishop Lightfoot has done more safely, because more naturally, though with less rhetorical point, in accepting Bishop Wordsworth's well-known emendation, *γυναῖκες, νεανίδες, παιδίσκαι* (*i.e.* women, maidens, and slave-girls) for *γυναῖκες, Δαναΐδες καὶ Δίρκαι.*

The second book, 'S. Peter and the Church Catholic,' is less popular, but it embraces a great deal of valuable material. The fifth chapter contains a summary of the writings of the Apostles and early Christians, and points out very well the superiority of the Canonical Epistles to those of Clement and 'Barnabas,' the first eclectic without genius, the second Pauline almost to heresy.[1] This contrast is very necessary to be observed in the discussion as to the date and authenticity of some of the Catholic Epistles, especially those of S. Peter and S. James, and Dr. Farrar recurs to it very properly in that connection. If they and some of the 'Pauline' epistles are later and not authentic, then some of the most beautiful and effective of Christian writings are to be attributed to unknown persons in the second century, who assumed a name not their own with a fraud that can hardly be dignified as 'pious.'

[1] Dr. Farrar is, perhaps, rather hard upon such mystical interpretations as that of the number of Abraham's servants in Barnabas ch. ix., which he calls 'Rabbinic, but not Christian' (p. 105). He has shown the same feeling in a paper in the *Expositor* called, we believe, 'The Clearing of the Commentaries,' and many in the present day will sympathize with him. But is it not wiser to be more generous to those who do not feel themselves able to set such distinct limits to the meaning and analogical import of the sacred text? Such commentators might say of Dr. Farrar that he was 'Antiochene but not Alexandrian'—though his study of the Epistle to the Hebrews shows that he has a feeling of sympathy even for Rabbinical interpretations (p. 356). Bishop Pearson certainly speaks of 'the forward zeal of some ancient Fathers' in this connection, but his notes show how important and widespread authority there is for this particular interpretation (*On the Creed*, p. 356 foll. Oxford 1864). We may notice, by the way, that Dr. Farrar has fallen into a curious but explicable blunder on this matter. The number 318 is not 'represented by IHT,' but by TIH, though Barnabas, explaining the Greek words *δεκαοκτὼ καὶ τριακοσίους*, naturally puts the *ιη'* before the *τ'*.

It may indeed be urged, by those who reject the Pauline authorship of the 'Hebrews,' that that Epistle long went under a false name, and was only of late assigned to its rightful owner, or at least its rightful position in the Canon. But the cases are not at all parallel, as the Epistle to the Hebrews was from the first anonymous, and in any case is earlier than the Epistle of Clement (circa A.D. 95). We think, then, that the historical improbability of a fraudulent palming off of such powerful and genuinely Christian documents upon an age by no means simply uncritical far outweighs any difficulties of internal evidence or unequal attestation, the existence of which we do not blink or deny. Dr. Farrar feels the force of this, and therefore while he states without reserve the difficulties which beset the Second Epistle of S. Peter, and particularly the coincidences with Josephus to which he and Dr. Abbott have recently called attention, he inclines to conclude that 'it is still in its main essence genuine as well as canonical, and that there is a reason both for its peculiarities and for its tardy reception' (p. 207). This reason he finds in the supposition that the Epistle is mainly the work of some one else to whom the Apostle gave 'the sanction of his name and the assistance of his advice.' But this seems an awkward way out of the difficulty, especially when we remember the strongly personal touches—the forecast of his own death (i. 15), the reminiscences of the Transfiguration (i. 16 foll.), the reference to the First Epistle (iii. 1), and to 'our beloved brother Paul' (iii. 15). Expressions like these surely prove that the Epistle is authentic, unless we adopt the improbable supposition that it is the work of a clever imitator of authenticity. There seems to be no mean between these alternatives. Nor does Dr. Farrar meet Dr. Abbott's difficulty, except by the rather difficult suggestion: 'If, then, the Epistle be genuine, it cannot be questioned that it was known to Josephus' (p. 193). There are, however, at least two other suppositions possible. The first, that S. Peter and Josephus both have verbal reminiscences of the same older book or books; the second, that the similarity of style is due to the fact that the Second Epistle of S. Peter is a translation. With regard to the first possibility, until Philo and Josephus are both properly indexed, or rather have, as they ought to have, perfect concordances made to them, it is very hard to prove much about them. Had Philo's *Life of Moses*, for instance, been searched as carefully as Josephus, it is possible that all these phrases—some of them common enough—might have been found in the earlier writer. But considering the facts actually before

us, we think that the second supposition is much more probable: that the similarity is due to the style of the translator of S. Peter's letter being moulded on that of Josephus. Dr. Farrar, indeed, considers this idea of a translation, but rejects it, observing that the Epistle has 'an energy of its own, which excludes the possibility of its being a translation' (p. 207). Is it not, however, true that the book of Ecclesiasticus has, in its way, a great deal of energy, though it is a translation made by Jesus the son of Sirach some time after the death of his grandfather? What is still more to the purpose, in considering this and similar cases where a translation from an Aramaic original has been supposed—as in that of the Gospel according to S. Matthew and the Epistle to the Hebrews—is the parallel of Josephus himself. He tells us in his preface to the *Wars of the Jews*, 'I have proposed to myself, for the sake of such as live under the government of the Romans, to translate those books into the Greek tongue which I formerly composed in the language of our own country and sent to the upper barbarians,' that is, as he informs us a little later, the Parthians and Babylonians, and the Jews beyond the Euphrates and in the neighbouring lands. Yet no one can assert that the *Wars of the Jews*, in its Greek dress, is a book deficient in energy and rhetorical power. It is certainly written in a style of Greek far more flowing and classical than the books which bear the names of S. Peter and S. Matthew, if not the Epistle to the Hebrews. We believe that S. Peter himself was incapable of writing or speaking Greek with fluency, and that his incapacity was shared, very possibly, by the other writers of the Catholic Epistles, with the exception of S. John, who, as we shall see presently, was probably a good many years in acquiring a full command of the language. With regard to S. Peter, we have the fact that ancient Church tradition (appearing first in Papias) calls S. Mark his 'interpreter,' while a similar report names another, Glaucias, as having held the same position.[1] This word has been variously explained, but as used by Papias its natural meaning is surely one who interpreted from Aramaic into Greek. Certainly the verb ἑρμηνεύειν has this sense in the other closely parallel and, in our opinion, contextual sentence in which the same writer describes the Gospel according to S. Matthew.[2] To say that S. Mark made S. Peter's meaning clear to others, as we talk

[1] Glaucias, it is said, became a Gnostic. Could his apostasy have thrown suspicion on any of the work done by him for the Apostle?

[2] Papias in Eusebius, *Church History*, iii. 39, 15, 16.

metaphorically of 'interpreting' a piece of music, or that he interpreted for him into Latin, is certainly less natural.[1] We have no trace of Latin preaching in Rome till a considerably later date, and certainly none of a Latin Gospel of S. Mark. What seems probable, then, is that S. Peter preached everywhere in the synagogues in Aramaic, a procedure which would endear him to those of Hebrew birth and education (cp. Acts xxii. 2), and that S. Mark interpreted on the spot into Greek for the benefit of the Hellenists and proselytes who might be present. Modern missions could, we suppose, supply many instances of such a double method of preaching to a congregation made up of different races. His epistles were probably rendered by two distinct translators. The second very possibly remained untranslated longer than the first, and this would explain the fact that it seems to have been little known to the Churches of the first and second centuries.[2] This explanation, we may remark, helps to throw light on two peculiar features of this group of epistles, the 'mixture of presents and futures' in which Dr. Farrar finds a difficulty (p. 195) and the remarkable Æschylean phraseology. S. Peter and S. Jude could hardly themselves have written in poetic Greek 'which they had partly learnt from the language of the tragedians'—as Dr. Farrar well tells us the writers of these epistles do (p. 207 *note*, cp .p. 236 *note*). But those who had learnt Greek for the purpose of translating Aramaic writings would naturally have this strange book-learned style, in which the diction is superior to the grammar and syntax. We are most of us familiar with Bengâli English, which frequently presents something similar in its mixture of poetic colouring and awkward syntax. The same remarks apply in their measure to the Epistle of S. James.

We have little or no fault to find with Dr. Farrar's treatment of the 'spirits in prison' and the 'Gospel preached to the dead.' He is careful to note that 'there is no dogma either of universalism or of conditional immortality' in S. Peter (p. 141); and, apart from some rather hard words about 'dogmatic embarrassment,' when he might rather have

[1] Dr. Farrar rather wavers on S. Mark's relation to S. Peter, but suggests 'interpretation' into Latin (vol. ii. p. 21 *note*).

[2] Dr. Farrar says (i. p. 178), 'It is not found . . . in the Vetus Itala.' The phrase 'Vetus Itala' is now generally given up by Biblical scholars. He probably means 'was not known to Tertullian and the early African Church.' The true 'Itala,' the version or versions used in Italy, is a different thing. The existence of a Latin translation of this epistle anterior to S. Jerome seems at least probable from the character of the text in the Cava and Toledo MSS.

said 'fearfulness of error and careful adherence to the tradition of the Church,' he has kept the subject within its proper bounds in such a book (pp. 137–143).

As to S. Peter's connexion with Rome, Dr. Farrar concludes, with most moderate and learned English writers since the time of Bishop Pearson,[1] that the Apostle was martyred there, but did not preach there till within a short time of his death. He does not, however, add much to the discussion of this difficult subject. We miss references to such books as Lipsius' *Petrus-Sage* and *Chronologie der Römischen Bischöfe*, and even to Bishop Lightfoot's edition of Clement and older books. The evidence of Dionysius of Corinth is not very fairly treated. It is said to be 'a slight allusion' neutralized by 'being found in the same sentence with the erroneous suggestion that Peter had a share in the founding (φύτευαν) of the Church of Corinth' (ii. p. 513). What Dionysius really says is, writing to the Church of Rome in the days of Soter (circa A.D. 170):—

'So you (as Clement in his day), through your valuable admonition, have brought into union the planting of Peter and Paul among the Romans and Corinthians. For both of them, having planted in our Corinth also, taught us in like manner; and in like manner also, coming together as teachers in Italy, gave their testimony' (or 'were martyred,' ἐμαρτύρησαν) 'at the same time.'[2]

He could hardly have spoken more strongly. Surely Dionysius of Corinth knew much better than any of us whether S. Peter had worked in his own city or not. It is absurd to attempt to prove a negative with the slight materials at our disposal. That he founded the Church of Corinth in the strictest sense is obviously untrue; but words like 'founding' and 'planting' are used vaguely and generally by the early Fathers for any Apostolic work near the beginning of the Gospel. It is clear that S. Paul did not, in the strictest sense, 'found' the Roman Church; and the same thing is probably even more true of S. Peter, yet the Church of Rome is justified in using ordinary language when she styles them

[1] *De Successione primorum Romæ Episcoporum*, capp. vi.–viii.—*Minor Works*, vol. ii. pp. 323–366. It is a great mistake to suppose that all the useful facts contained in such dissertations have been absorbed into modern books on the subject. Bishop Pearson's work is so solid and coherent that it must be examined at length in order to make its proper impression.

[2] Dionysius in Eusebius, *Ch. History*, ii. 25. 8, taken together with iv. 23. 11: εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν ὁμόσε διδάξαντες is rendered by Valesius as if the last word was φοιτήσαντες. Cp. Routh, *Rel. Sacræ*, i. p. 191 foll. Ὁμόσε, however, perhaps rather implies meeting from different quarters.

her founders and builders (cp. *Iren.* iii. 1 and 3). There is also a hint in S. Paul's Second Epistle to Timothy which suggests a time for this partnership in work of which Dionysius speaks. 'Erastus (he writes) abode at Corinth, and Trophimus I left behind at Miletus sick' (2 Tim. iv. 20). Whether the two events are stated in chronological or inverse order, the words seem to show that S. Paul had been at Corinth shortly before his second Roman imprisonment. It is not unnatural to suppose that a meeting with S. Peter at this time led to their cordial co-operation at Corinth, and was a prelude to even more important work in Rome.

Dr. Farrar throws no light on the 'twenty-five years of S. Peter,' except to show that it is dropped as a dogma by more enlightened Roman Catholics. It seems, however, to be a point deserving of explanation, and capable of being further illustrated. The following account of how the belief arose was suggested by reading Dr. Salmon's valuable paper on the 'Chronology of Hippolytus' in the Dublin *Hermathena*, which it appears worth while to offer to the consideration of scholars. It seems, in short, to be a datum having no positive value whatever, but merely to represent the interval between the supposed date of the appointment of Linus to the episcopate and the ascension of Our Lord. The date of the appointment of Linus was fixed not by any actual synchronism of consular or other dates, but by reckoning back from some known point in the second or third century with the aid of a list of the Roman pontiffs, containing merely the number of years during which each presided.[1] As in the earlier names on this list, portions of years were most probably counted as full years, the aggregate term was considerably swelled out, and so the appointment of Linus was fixed to the year 55, probably ten or twelve years too early. The interval between this date and the Ascension, which we may reasonably suppose to have been fixed by tradition to the year 29, the consulship of the two Gemini, was then assigned to S. Peter. This was no pretence or deception at all, but a very natural process, since the chronologists wished to carry up the succession of Bishops to Christ Himself. But, after a time, this twenty-five years came to be considered to have a positive value, and was made to harmonize with a legendary visit of S. Peter to Rome in the reign of Claudius, and a possibly

[1] 'Nomina Episcoporum Romæ et quis quot annis præfuit.' See the unfortunately mutilated chronicle extending from Adam to the last year of Alexander Severus, A.D. 235, first published by Canisius in 1602, and reprinted in the Bonn edition of the *Chronicon Paschale* and elsewhere.

corrected date for the appointment of Linus in the last year of Nero. In some such way as this we think arose the story that S. Peter visited Rome first in the year 42, and remained there as Bishop at intervals for twenty-five years, till the end of the reign of Nero.

The third book, on 'Apollos, Alexandrian Christianity and the Epistle to the Hebrews,' is full of interest, and exhibits Dr. Farrar's powers to great advantage. He has massed together the arguments in favour of the authorship of Apollos with great skill, and if there were any historical evidence for the fact, we should have little hesitation in accepting it. But as no one even made the conjecture before Luther, we can only leave the matter in the uncertainty in which the wisest of the Fathers were satisfied to let it remain. We think, however, that, while making all allowance for the parallels of Pauline doctrine and language, he has stated the case against the Pauline authorship most ably; and that his arguments against the mediate or immediate authorship of S. Luke, which has a good deal of direct and indirect evidence in its favour, are weighty and plausible.

'In spite of these resemblances' (he says, p. 335) 'the style and tone of the Epistle to the Hebrews differ essentially from those of S. Luke. Balanced rhetoric and majestic periods are nowhere found in the writings of the Evangelist, and it is psychologically difficult to believe that a writer whose prevailing tone of mind was tender and conciliatory should have written passages of such uncompromising sternness as those which occur in Heb. vi. 4–8; x. 26; xii. 27. In these passages the sternest Montanists exulted, and they were used as bulwarks of the Novatians in their refusal to readmit the lapsed to baptism or the Lord's Supper.'

We do not think he is equally powerful in his treatment of the destination of the Epistle, which he rather inclines to believe may have been 'the Jewish portion of the Church of Ephesus, where both Apollos and Timothy were well known, and in which they had both laboured' (p. 344). We do not see any sufficient reason to doubt the traditional belief that the Church of Jerusalem is intended; nay, certain considerations seem to point very conclusively to it. In the first place Dr. Farrar has not met the strong arguments of Delitzsch and Bleek on this point—to name only two of those who have defended the received opinion—of whom it is noticeable that one inclines to S. Luke, and the other to Apollos as the author of the Epistle.

'The Church of the Hebrews,' we must remember, is an old name for the Church of Jerusalem, which Eusebius tells us

was composed of 'Hebrew believers' (ἐξ Ἑβραίων πιστῶν),[1] and ever since the time of Clement of Alexandria it has been the tradition of the Church that 'to the Hebrews' means the Christians of Jerusalem.

'The whole Epistle (says Delitzsch) gives the impression that its readers must have lived in the neighbourhood of the Temple, the antithesis throughout not being that of συναγωγή and church, but of Temple and ἐπισυναγωγή of Christians.'[2]

'The Churches in Jerusalem and Judæa (says Bleek) . . . consisted almost exclusively of Jews. . . . Of Gentile Christians, properly so called, there were few or none, which agrees with the contents of this Epistle, where . . . no notice whatever is taken of Gentile Christians—a fact very unlikely to have occurred if the Church the author had in his mind were made up of Jews and Gentiles together.'[3]

Dr. Farrar's objections to this view are (p. 342) the Greek writing and quotations from the Septuagint;[4] the statement 'that they had not yet resisted unto blood;' the absence of reference to Christ's actual words and sufferings in their midst; the tone of authority, especially the rebuke of ch. v. 11–14; and the mention of Timothy as one in whom they would be interested. The first difficulty we have already met by a reference to the parallel of Josephus, which shows that the Epistle may be a translation from the Aramaic, without loss of rhetorical spirit; and we may remember that the Hellenist Stephen at least made himself heard in the Jewish Sanhedrim. The assertion 'Ye have not yet resisted unto blood' is not inconsistent with the exhortation to remember the martyrdom (as it seems) of their leaders in past years made in xiii. 7. The reference is generally supposed to be to James the Just; and certainly the other historical notes in the Epistle fit well with what we know and must imagine the state of the Jewish Church shortly after his death. We may dwell for a little on this point, as it is one of some importance.

James the Just was probably martyred in the year 62, in the interval between the sudden death of Festus and the coming of Albinus as procurator. The Epistle was, we suppose,

[1] [Clementis] *Ep. ad Jacob. Hom.* xi. 35, and Eus. *H. E.* iv. 5; Delitzsch, *Hebrews*, i. p. 21, E. T.

[2] Delitzsch, *Hebrews*, i. p. 21, E. T.

[3] Bleek, *Introd. to the New Testament*, § 199, vol. ii. p. 124, E. T.

[4] That the quotations, however, are by no means exactly taken from the LXX has been shown in vol. x. of this *Review*, p. 369 (July 1880). About two-thirds of them are 'more or less free translations from the Hebrew; thrown off as it were rapidly by some one skilled in that and the Greek version as well.'

written a few years later, when the national party in Jerusalem were preparing for the struggle, which afterwards ended so calamitously. The position of the Hebrew Christians was naturally a very critical one. They were subject to the very strong temptation of swimming with the current, to which patriotic motives might seem so readily to lead them. They began to forsake their church assemblies, and made little or no resistance to the factions which trampled law and order under foot during that terrible period. But their Master did not suffer them to be lost. A strange moment arrived in November, A.D. 66, when Cestius Gallus, President of Syria, appeared before the city, made himself master of the suburbs and its lower parts, and commenced a vigorous assault upon the Temple, which he continued for five days. This, we believe, was the moment prophetically described by Our Lord, when His disciples should see the abomination of desolation, the Roman eagle, standing in the holy place, Mount Sion. The Lord having given the warning, gave also the opportunity of profiting by it.[1] Cestius, in a sudden fit of irresolution, without any apparent reason, called off his own troops, and to the universal surprise retreated entirely from the city. Josephus, in relating this astonishing circumstance, can only suppose that it was a design of Providence to bring about the more complete destruction of the city. 'God, I conceive, on account of our sins, abhorring His own sanctuary, would not permit the war to end thus' (*Wars*, ii. 19. 6). What a light does this strange incident throw both upon Our Lord's prophecy, and upon the conclusion of the Epistle! For even though it had not yet occurred, some such moment must have been expected by all who remembered the great prophecies of the last things. Thus we read in the Epistle of the reasons why Jesus suffered without the gate, and then follows the exhortation, 'Let us therefore go forth unto Him without the camp, bearing His reproach. For we have not here an abiding city, but we seek after *the city* which is to come' (xiii. 13, 14, R. V.). If we refer this to the condition of the Hebrew Christians at Jerusalem just before they left their doomed and devoted city to sojourn in Pella, does it not go far to supply the want which Dr. Farrar notices of references to Our Lord's particular connection with Jerusalem? It is true that, with the exception of the word 'city,' the imagery is throughout that of the tabernacle, rather than of the Temple of Solomon; but this fits in wonderfully with

[1] Dr. Farrar puts the flight to Pella possibly in A.D. 68, vol. ii. p. 193. We think it was probably earlier.

the parallelism between the first and last periods of Jewish history. The nation was chosen by God, and moulded for forty years before it entered Canaan. For forty years after the Ascension it was tried by the same long-suffering Providence before it was finally unmade and rejected. The writer of the Epistle had surely a perception of this most striking parallel, and as an old man goes back to the days of his childhood, so he, in the last days of Israel's national existence, goes back to Abraham, and Moses, and Aaron, and the tabernacle, and Joshua, and the forty years in the wilderness, rather than to the intervening period. He perceives that the time of trial will soon be ended, that the rest of the true Jesus will be entered by the faithful; but he fears that many will fall by the way in the wilderness, and fail to enter in by reason of unbelief and sinful compliance with the spirit of the time. This thought we believe gives a rationale and coherence to the Epistle which we miss in Dr. Farrar's interesting and instructive pages.

The point on which he lays most stress as against the Church of Jerusalem—of the sharpness of the rebuke at the end of the fifth chapter—seems to lose its force if we imagine the pain and terror which such falling away of this community would give a sincere believer, whether Hebrew or Hellenist. Here again recollect the sharpness of S. Stephen's rebuke. That the Church was in danger of such a fall, after the death of S. James and the departure or exile of S. John, is hardly to be doubted. This letter may have been of incalculable value in preventing a fall which would have distressed and weakened the whole of Christendom. The mention of Timothy is too slight to be matter of real argument; but we believe that we have fairly met the most important of Dr. Farrar's objections, and have shown, in addition, positive reasons for the general opinion on the subject, with which he does not deal.

The general treatment of the Epistle is, however, very interesting, and cannot fail to suggest new thoughts to anyone who really wishes to understand it. We should instance particularly the description of the Day of Atonement from rabbinical sources, which we wish we had space to quote, and the passages about Melchizedek.

We must pass on to the latter part of the work. Book IV. on 'Judaic Christianity' deals with the controverted topic of the 'Brethren of the Lord,' the life and character of S. James and the matter of his Epistle. Dr. Farrar's treatment of the first of these subjects has provoked, and will provoke, some hostile criticism, and we think with reason. A great deal of the

argument is indeed sound enough. We are agreed with him in thinking the theory that the 'brethren of the Lord' were his first cousins and some of them apostles, must be given up in the face of S. John's plain statement 'even His brethren did not believe on Him'—a statement not referring to the beginning of His ministry, but to the time of the Feast of Tabernacles, some six months before its close (John viii. 5). But in our author's adoption of the Helvidian theory, which is that the mother of Our Lord had four sons and several daughters born after Our Saviour's birth, we cannot follow him. Dr. Farrar recommends this view, not merely as most accordant with what he holds the plain meaning of Scripture, but as giving dignity to marriage in opposition to celibacy. We think that in so doing he has understated the case against the Helvidian theory. In his zealous opposition to monasticism he has forgotten that both Our Lord and S. Paul speak in favour of celibacy for the kingdom of God's sake (S. Matt. xix. 12; 1 Cor. vii. 1, 6, 7, 8, 26, 34); not, that is to say, as a virtue in itself, but as affording opportunity for devotion to God's service without distraction. It is surely not true to say of Our Lord, 'He never breathed one word to exalt the celibate over the wedded life' (p. 505).[1] Surely too the unique subject of meditation which filled the mind of the Mother of the Lord, might naturally separate her from the distractions, cares and joys of common wifehood and motherhood. When, therefore, we find a widespread opinion in the early Church, especially among the Greek Fathers, unconnected with any theory as to celibacy, and particularly current in Palestine, where there was less tendency than elsewhere to depreciate marriage, that the 'brethren' and 'sisters' of Our Lord belonged to an elder family, being children of a former wife of S. Joseph, we naturally are ready to accept it. We think that if any one will turn from Dr. Farrar to Bishop Lightfoot's essay on 'The Brethren of the Lord' in his Commentary on the Galatians, they will be surprised at the slight treatment of this part of the subject in the book before us, and will agree with the Bishop of Durham that the Epiphanian theory, as it is called, though it is really much older than Epiphanius, has both the balance of scriptural evidence and tradition in its favour. Dr. Farrar is curiously incorrect when he says of this explanation, 'its first

[1] In vol. ii. p. 114, Dr. Farrar refers to 'the passages of Zohar quoted by Schöttgen, p. 159,' as explaining away the natural (not the Origenistic) interpretation of S. Matt. xix. 12. Zohar is a cabbalistic book of very doubtful, possibly of very late, date, and for this particular interpretation no single Rabbi is quoted by name, but only 'learned men.'

respectable support comes at the close of the fourth century, and its earlier traces are only found embedded in worthless and pernicious forgeries' (p. 508). Bishop Lightfoot says, 'Clement of Alexandria (about A.D. 200) . . . put forward the Epiphanian solution' (*l. c.* p. 279, ed. 7). 'Origen (A.D. 253) declares himself very distinctly in favour of the Epiphanian view' (*ib.* p. 281). He also puts a higher value upon the evidence of the apocryphal literature, and supposes Hegesippus to have held the Epiphanian theory, inasmuch as both 'Eusebius and Epiphanius, who derived their information mainly from Hegesippus, gave this account of Our Lord's brethren' (p. 278). We think too that the very pertinent question why Our Lord committed His mother to S. John rather than to His 'brethren' is much more soundly treated by Bishop Lightfoot (p. 272 foll.) than by Dr. Farrar (p. 502 foll.). He has not really met the argument which the former has thus stated. Even admitting that the brethren were passed over at first as 'unbelievers,' what (he asks) does this hypothesis require us to believe?

'Though within a few days a special appearance is vouchsafed to one of these brethren who is destined to rule the mother Church of Jerusalem, and all alike are converted to the faith of Christ, yet she, their mother, living in the same city and joining with them in a common worship (Acts i. 14), is consigned to the care of a stranger,[1] of whose house she becomes henceforth the inmate.'

We do not suppose that Dr. Farrar will change his mind: but we entreat him to state the case on the other side a little more fully, and to enter a little more heartily into the feelings of those who differ from him on this topic. We notice however, with pleasure, as an indication of two currents of feeling in his mind, that he speaks of S. John as being 'one of the very few depositories of the awful mysteries which . . . had been pondered for many years in the holy reticence of the Virgin's heart' (i. 96 foll.; cp. ii. 142).

The general treatment of the authenticity of the Epistle of S. James, of its matter, and of the question of its relation to S. Paul, is very good. Our author reconciles the two views of faith and works as follows (ii. p. 94):—

'The superficial contradiction between the Apostles vanishes to nothing when we bear in mind that S. Paul is dealing with the vain confidence of legalism, S. James with the vain confidence of orthodoxy. S. Paul was writing to Gentile Christians to prevent them

[1] This word is, however, too strong, especially if S. John was, as we believe, the nephew of the Blessed Virgin, son of her sister Salome.

from being seduced into trusting for salvation to the adoption of external badges and ceremonials or to good deeds done in a spirit of servile fear. S. James is arguing either with Jewish bigots who thought that a profession of Monotheism and a participation in Jewish privileges would save them, or with mistaken Paulinists who had snatched up a formula which they did not understand, and who thought that justification could be severed from sanctification —that a saving faith was possible without the holiness of an accordant life. S. Paul is contrasting faith in Christ with the works of the law; S. James is contrasting a dead mixed faith with a faith which evidences its reality by holy works. S. Paul's arguments were meant to overthrow the vain confidence of the Pharisee; S. James's tell equally against the Jew who pillowed his hopes on fruitless orthodoxy and the Antinomian who identified saving faith with barren profession.'

The fifth and last book, occupying the greater part of the second volume, is headed 'On the Earlier Life and Works of S. John'; but—inasmuch as a large portion of it deals with the history of the fall of Jerusalem, the growth of heresy, and the three Epistles, the first of which Dr. Farrar puts after the Gospel, though in close connection with it—the title is somewhat inconsistent with the contents. Dr. Farrar's treatment of the legends respecting S. John is full and interesting. We agree with him in thinking that the story about Cerinthus and the bath is discredited by the improbability of an Apostle using such a place of Gentile and frivolous resort. But both here, and in his treatment of the command not to receive a heretic and bid him God speed, he is carried away by that poetic 'hate of hate,' with which he is so highly dowered. In the latter case there is a long passage against the *odium theologicum* (ii. pp. 497–503), which surely might with advantage be omitted. If the lady did as S. John desired, and refused a traveller because he was a heretic, in a country where inns were few and hospitality a virtue, she was doing something no doubt perfectly right, but which the heretic probably thought very unkind. The *odium theologicum* is a very odious thing, but truth sometimes may require us (as Dr. Farrar shows) to be apparently hard and unsympathetic towards those who differ from us, sometimes in self-defence, sometimes in defence of those who belong to the household of faith. The cases where this is right and where it is wrong can only be settled by reference to particular circumstances.

Among the traditions with respect to the later days of S. John we miss the account of the origin of his Gospel, and of the presence of his brother-Apostles, Andrew and Philip, with him at Ephesus. Though this is more or less dis-

cussed elsewhere (*e.g.* ii. pp. 358, 374), it is clearly in place in chap. xxvi., and is indeed necessary to the picture. That Andrew and Philip were present in Asia Minor is an independent tradition ;[1] that Andrew—the ready suggester, who thinks and decides for others, as he is described to us in the Gospel—was the suggester also of S. John's writing, is the very probable report of the Muratorian fragment ; that Andrew and Philip are the two unnamed disciples of S. John xxi. 2, and specially concerned with the production of the whole chapter and its final attestation, is a very plausible opinion. A few words here might save space elsewhere.

The reader will naturally turn with some excitement of feeling to the chapters on the Apocalypse. Dr. Farrar, as might be expected, is one of those who place the exile to Patmos in the reign of Nero, not in that of Domitian. He does not succeed in explaining S. Irenæus' well-known statement that it was seen shortly before his own time in the reign of Domitian—for ἑωράθη in this connection cannot seriously be referred to S. John's own person. He does however recal with some force the other probably mistaken tradition which S. Irenæus gives, as a set-off against the decisive weight we should naturally assign to his testimony, and he states the case for the earlier date with vigour and persuasiveness. To us the difference of style between the Apocalyse and the Gospel, and the contrast between the vivid and abrupt force of the one and the admirable and quiet precision of the other, has for some time seemed a very strong argument for the separation of the two by as long an interval as possible, and for putting the Gospel and Epistles late in the Apostle's life. If S. John (and, as we have suggested, the other Apostles of the circumcision) was at first hardly acquainted with Greek as a written language—perhaps hardly able to speak it with ease and correctness at all—the Apocalypse would come in naturally as a first attempt at composition in Greek, forced from him by the burning spirit of the time, when he was called in his exile to minister to the Churches of Asia. Like Jeremiah in his prison house he may have had a faithful scribe by his side as he paced the bleak cliffs and seashore of Patmos, or sat within some retired cave. A book so written would bear the marks which the Apocalypse does. Here we have several series of addresses and visions not following chronologically but as parallel aspects of the same truths, each series leading up to the

[1] See Lightfoot's *Colossians*, p. 45.

great thought of the Advent and the Judgment as a triumph over the World, the Flesh, and the Devil. It is a book of visions, spoken rather than written, pouring with all the glow and fervour of immediate perception from the Prophet's mouth, and no wonder that the language sometimes cracks under the strain of the thought. The promise to the Seer at the end of the tenth chapter is also, like the language, consonant with the earlier rather than the later date. 'Thou must prophesy again before' (R. V. 'over') 'many peoples and nations and tongues and kings,' applies better to one who has thirty years of work still before him than to an old man in the last days of his life.

The Gospel, on the other hand, is like the work of a teacher who has lived long in a settled society of fellow-workers and scholars, who has repeated the same lessons over and over again, though, as Eusebius tells us, with 'unwritten preaching,' and reflected much upon the difficulties of his subject, and the questions which an almost academic and pedantic type of heresy has suggested. His companions for many years, perhaps, have been Greeks, and some of them learned—at least in the way that Apollos and Philo were learned. Andrew and Philip, the two Apostles with Greek names, who introduced to the Lord the first 'Greeks' who desired to see Jesus, have probably long been at his side. Thirty years in such an atmosphere accounts for the difference both of style and tone, and shows the two books in a way which is at least reasonable: and no other hypothesis that we know does so. It is a better hypothesis certainly than that of 'John the Presbyter,' and more decidedly still than the rejection of one or other of these Divine books from the canon.

As to the *interpretation* of the book, Dr. Farrar is a decided Præterist. Nero to him is the Beast, and the False Prophet is a composite symbol of Vespasian, Simon Magus, and Josephus; Domitian is the Beast reviving, and so on. Dr. Farrar's principles are well stated in the following passages (pp. 228, 229):—

'To me it seems that the founder of the Præterist school is none other than S. John himself. For he records the Christ as saying to him when he was in the Spirit, "Write the things which thou sawest, and THE THINGS WHICH ARE, and the things which are about to happen (ἃ μέλλει γίνεσθαι) after these things." . . . The Seer emphatically says that the future events which he has to foreshadow will occur *speedily* (ἐν τάχει), and the recurrent burden of his whole book is the nearness of the Advent (ὁ καιρὸς ἐγγύς). . . . The

Præterist mode of interpretation does not, however, interfere with that view of prophecy which was so well defined by Dr. Arnold. This is the view of those who have been called the "spiritual" interpreters. It admits of the *analogical* application of prophecy to conditions which in the cycles of history bear a close resemblance to each other. It applies to all times the principles originally laid down with reference to events which were being then enacted, and starts with the axiom of Bacon, that Divine prophecies have steps and grades of fulfilment through divers ages. All that is really valuable in the works of historical interpreters may thus be retained.'

We do not suppose that the ingenious explanation and common-sense rationalizing of the Apocalypse by the facts of that period of blood and terror, prevalent as it seems to be at present, will really long suffice to satisfy those who believe in the deep things of prophecy. But as Præterists like Dr. Farrar can admit the use of the 'spiritual' views of other schools by way of illustration, so can other interpreters accept many of the historical facts, which Dr. Farrar so effectively marshals together, as forming the natural occasions for prophetical forecasts of a wider and more mysterious import.

There is much in the treatment of the growth of heresy and the Epistles of S. John which is worth noticing, but we have not space for it here. We have naturally had rather to remark on points where we differ from Dr. Farrar, and where we think that he might strengthen and improve his position. If he could reduce his book by about a third, and concentrate it, and make it rigorously consistent, it would be much more valuable, and we think more likely to have a permanent place in theological literature. But in any case we are thankful to him for the greatest part of these volumes. We value much his warmth of heart, his poetical temperament, his moral indignation, his religious earnestness, his wide reading and appreciation of learning, his zeal and his eloquence. To a character like this compliments are out of place. He has placed his gifts at the service of the Gospel, not in any conventional sense, but as a work of conscience. By works of great labour he has brought home the meaning of biblical literature to classes of immense importance to the Church in a way that no other author of our day has done. We trust that having done so much and so well, he will not shrink from the further and greater labour of retrenching what is redundant, of harmonizing what is inconsistent, of removing what is needlessly antagonistic, and of making permanently better what is at present really good.

ART. V.—THE CLAIMS OF AUTHORITY IN MATTERS OF FAITH.

1. '*Hear the Church.*' A Sermon preached in the Chapel Royal in St. James's Palace, June 17, 1838. By WALTER FARQUHAR HOOK, D.D. (London, 1838.)
2. *The Influence of Authority on Matters of Opinion.* By SIR GEORGE CORNEWALL LEWIS, Bart. (London, 1875.)
3. *Report of Church Congress at Derby*, 1882. (Derby.)

IT is hard upon five-and-forty years ago that a sermon was preached in the Chapel Royal, St. James's, upon the words, 'Hear the Church.' The sermon attracted great attention at the time, and provoked much criticism. Indeed, it is supposed to have had a very marked influence upon the subsequent fortunes of the preacher. Hastily prepared, as we are now informed, and perhaps in some respects incautiously expressed, it was still a bold and unqualified assertion of the claims of authority in matters of religion, though of authority of one kind only, viz. that vested in a branch of the Catholic Church possessed of Apostolical succession. That such an announcement from the pulpit of the Chapel Royal at the lips of one of her Majesty's chaplains should have provoked so much comment, and should have stirred such warm feelings both among Churchmen and statesmen, was due not to any formal abandonment of her just rights by the National Church, nor to any actual or even virtual withdrawal of their submission by her members, but to the fact that, so far as any formal statement of them went, the Church's claims had long been in abeyance, and good and religious people had been guided by her Prayer Book and other formularies to a great extent unconsciously, and without any attempt to define either the source or the limits of the authority which they yet loyally accepted. Many circumstances had combined to produce this state of things. At a time when loyalty to the throne was in such close alliance with loyalty to the Church the authority of the one and of the other had become strangely confused. Churchmen had for generations been accustomed to be taught by their Church to honour the King and by the State to cling to the Church, and it had not occurred to them to draw clear logical dis-

tinctions in the matter. Not that the distinction was not there. It was on their shelves, in many a venerable though dusty and neglected tome. The movement of 1835–40 did but revive a dormant theology and call into new life and language a divinity which had long slumbered in the studies of country parsonages and in the libraries of the Universities. At the commencement of the movement the Oxford divines were always glad to appeal to the authority of Beveridge and his school; but in the meanwhile the distinct claims of the Church had become greatly obscured, and the honoured rallying cry of 'Church and King!' had caught a tone dangerously akin to Erastianism.

Nor was the danger imminent from this side only. Whilst the authority of the Church was thus falling into abeyance the co-ordinate authority of Holy Scripture was destined to receive a rude, and at the time a very alarming, shock. It is true that in the Church of England these two authorities had from the first exercised their legitimate and co-ordinate jurisdiction. She had distinctly accepted the three Creeds, and her appeal had been to the sacred Scriptures as interpreted by the ancient fathers. But on the Continent, and in those reformed communities with which, from political as much as from doctrinal affinities, she had been intimately connected, it was not so. When private judgment ran into absolute riot, and the authority of the Church had been utterly obscured, if not formally denied, the Continental reformers were driven by sheer necessity to cast themselves upon that of Scripture, and, by a natural exaggeration, to clothe with this authority every word—nay, virtually, every translation—of the Bible. So they were led to inaugurate, or at the least to countenance, a theory of literal inspiration which was destined to be the source of no small embarrassment in a subsequent more critical era. In England the same causes were in operation, though happily to a less injurious extent. Among the Nonconformists absolutely, and in a considerable degree within the Church as well, the dictum of Chillingworth expressed the popular sentiment:—'The Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants.' It was not yet perceived that in this, as in every other case, the authority which appeared to be intensified was in fact attenuated by exaggeration, and the claims of Holy Scripture to regulate the faith and direct the conscience of mankind began to suffer, as those of the Church had suffered 300 years before, from a forced and unnatural isolation. A critical school arose in Germany which soon made its influence felt in England. The authenticity of every

part of Scripture was assailed in turn, and with its authenticity its authority was attacked as well. It may be that we can now see that much good has resulted from the free criticism of the sacred text, and from the more scientific examination of the composition of Holy Scripture and the historical survey of the canon. It may be that we can now feel that the faith is recovering from the severe shock which it then received from the 'free handling' of its inspired records, and in regaining its equilibrium is perhaps settling down upon a more secure basis; but there can be little doubt that at the time the blow to authority was a very severe one, if only from the irreverence with which the movement was accompanied.

Thus the revolutionary wave of 1830 found the Church of England, and not the Church only but the general Christianity of England, but ill prepared to assert upon clear and distinct grounds the authority upon which it rested. The State support was rapidly giving way, the spiritual claims of the Church were in a manner forgotten, and an age of merciless criticism was to weaken, at least for a time, the authority of Scripture. At this crisis the Oxford divines certainly did admirable service in recalling attention to the Divine origin of the Church, and to the Divine authority with which she was empowered to speak as the witness to revealed truth. Many an English Churchman, both lay and cleric, who was unable to follow the school in its later developments has both felt and acknowledged his obligations to them in this respect.

Nor did the difficulty or danger cease here. To the critical school which undermined the authority of Holy Scripture succeeded a school of metaphysics, which associated itself with physical science and fought under its colours. Its tendency was distinctly towards materialism. It attacked the foundations of *all* religious faith, and herein thrust aside the authority of conscience itself, and did not scruple to do violence to the religious instincts of mankind. With the philosophers of this school the Being of God became an open question, whilst every truth of nature and of the soul, of life and duty, was resolved into a question of pure intellect. This was, in fact, their marked characteristic. The intellect was assumed to be the highest constituent of man's nature, the arbiter in all spiritual questions, supreme in the departments not of science only, but of faith and morals also. This, then, is the point to which we have at last arrived; and no time can be more appropriate to a review of our position, nor to a calm and reasonable investigation of those claims to autho-

rity which we believe may be legitimately put forward in the names of conscience, of Holy Scripture, and of the Church—the first as establishing the very basis of morals and of religion, the second as conveying the revelation of Divine truth, the third as formulating and bearing witness to that revelation.

It may be within the recollection of our readers that in a recent number of this Review we discussed the claims of free thought, and were led to assign to it a legitimate province and an important office in the investigation of religious truth. It was admitted that even in the sphere of religion, to which it has been popularly held to be antagonistic, it is capable of rendering valuable service, of contributing to preserve truth in its purity and to free it from the incrustations of prejudice or habit. At the same time it was maintained that it could discharge this office only under certain conditions and with important limitations.

The principle of authority, with which we come now to deal, may perhaps be described as the rival of free thought; but if we adopt this distinction we by no means imply that they are necessarily hostile to each other. On the contrary, there is a point of view from which they are mutually dependent, and each positively necessary to the other. If we except the precise dogmas of revelation, authority is indebted to free thought for her sceptre and her domain. It is thought, free and expansive, which supplies the material over which authority ultimately exercises her sway; whilst, on the other hand, it is authority which, so to say, collects and maintains in their cohesion the truths which speculation has ascertained and which form the groundwork of fresh discoveries in the future.

It is maintained by Mr. Wilson, in the very able paper read by him at the Derby Church Congress, that the two move altogether in different planes, that there is no fear of their collision, no danger resulting from their antagonism. 'One is the force regarded as securing growth, the other the same force as securing continuity.' We confess that we do not think that this is strictly so, that the forces are identical, or that, in practice, their working is always so harmonious as is here implied. Mr. Wilson admits that 'the facts of conscience, of consciousness, of hope, and aspiration and worship' are 'spiritual facts which have no verification but themselves, and that 'these facts lie in a region equally beyond authority and free thought;' but it must be remembered that free thought has not scrupled from time to

time to deal very arbitrarily with these 'facts;' that she has repeatedly questioned the very existence of conscience, and gone far to displace the received basis of morals without succeeding in suggesting in its place any which can be accepted as satisfactory; and that so far as she has indulged in theories of materialism she has done much to deny altogether the 'spiritual facts of hope, and aspiration and worship.' Indeed, in a subsequent passage Mr. Wilson admits that 'in the axioms of ethics' we are justified in treating free thought as a crime. What is this but to acknowledge that there is in conscience a natural authority against which it is from time to time the temptation of free thought to rebel, and that the transgression results in action which is to be held as no other than a crime? It is true that the supremacy of authority in the department of morals is here based upon 'the enormous mass of observed facts and experience of human nature upon which these axioms rest;' but we cannot suppose that Mr. Wilson really means that the axioms, whether of ethics or of any other science, rest upon experience or induction. Surely the axioms, whether of morals or of mathematics, are antecedent, not subsequent to induction. We cannot, therefore, withdraw from the position of our former article, that there is an authority in conscience—and in revelation also when once recognized as such—which we affirm to be natural; and an authority in creeds and constitutions, civil or ecclesiastical, which we cannot describe as wholly artificial; and that between these and free thought there is apt to arise a sharp and dangerous collision. Happy is it alike for truth and for mankind where this collision is avoided. But for this it is evident that calmness, discretion, and a wise self-restraint are eminently needful.

Let it be said, in starting, that in advocating the claims of authority we are proposing no novel or artificial principle. It has its roots in human nature and in the constitution of things—

> 'For out of the old fieldes, as men saith,
> Cometh al this newe corne fro' yere to yere;
> And out of olde bokes, in good faith,
> Cometh all this newe science that men love.'

So sung Chaucer five centuries ago, bearing curious witness to the ancient rivalry of which we write. Not in religion only, but in law, in medicine, in every fine art, and even in the schools of science itself, the voice of authority is necessarily heard. It asserts its rights in every branch of education.

Wherever men are compelled to resort to others of more complete instruction or of wider experience, there the principle is acknowledged. When an expert in some special branch of knowledge is called in to the assistance of a court of justice the very majesty of law bends its ear and stoops to receive a lesson from authority less exalted than its own.

It may, however, be objected that in the case of religion the analogy does not hold: that the interest is so personal, and the responsibility so direct, that herein a man can admit no master and be bound by no dictum. No cry has ever been so popular as that of religious liberty, even when it has been held to include the liberty of repudiating religion altogether. And we so far admit this plea as to acknowledge that whilst in religion a man may well accept the guidance of men wiser and more experienced than himself, there can be but one authority to which he is bound to submit absolutely and without reserve, and that is the Voice of God Himself.

When God spake to Abraham and the prophets it was by a clear sensible impression made upon the soul, distinct and unmistakable as the voice of man to man. How such an impression was conveyed, how the mind became conscious of the Divine communications, and able to distinguish them from all other utterances, is a mystery which we cannot fathom; but sure we are that were we to become thus distinctly conscious of the Divine Voice, our duty would be implicit submission, whether of the intellect or of the will. A command so authenticated must claim our obedience, however contrary to our inclination; a revelation so guaranteed must receive our assent, how far soever removed from our intelligence. The only question which can arise will be as to the source from which the intimation reaches us. If once that source be ascertained to be Divine its authority must be binding and absolute. The real question, then, is, Does Almighty God thus communicate to mankind the truths of His Being and the injunctions of His Will? Is there still heard upon the earth that Sovereign Voice to which all must bow? Or has God indeed 'left Himself without a witness,' and for all that is spiritual and immortal created man 'for naught'? We maintain that God does thus speak; that the Divine Voice is still heard in the conscience, in Holy Scripture, in the Church. Not that the Divine revelation is made in each of these in the same way, nor in every case with the same distinctness, but still in each one with such measure of distinctness, and with such adaptation to our capacity, as to demand our reverent attention, and to minister directly to our guidance alike in

thought and action. And here let us premise one most important consideration.

It will be observed that we have claimed for conscience, Holy Scripture, and the Church, an authority paramount for each in its own sphere, and this notwithstanding that our apprehension of each may be in its measure fallible, and notwithstanding that the Voice may in each case be at times obscure, at times misunderstood. For we admit that conscience may be imperfectly developed or wrongly instructed; that Holy Scripture may be at times obscure, and in some few passages of uncertain authenticity; that occasionally in matters of doctrine, certainly in matters of practice, individual Churches may err and have erred. It is no less wise than candid to make such an admission at the outset, for we are well aware that sooner or later it will be demanded at our hands. Yet, after all, to what does this admission amount? Simply to this, *that the claim to infallibility is in no way essential to the claim of authority*, and, in fact, is rather inconsistent with it; for the sensible presence of an infallible director would amount to little else than a physical compulsion.

An infallible guide in opinion or in action, to be effectually such, implies a corresponding intelligence on the part of those who are to submit to its direction, for if the infallible declarations be imperfectly understood the result is evidently liability to error. In vain do the most exquisite harmonies fall upon an ear incapable of appreciating them; in vain are the most complete demonstrations of most accurate science addressed to a mind unprepared to receive them. We have often doubted whether it were possible even for the Divine Intelligence to communicate to the mind of man, whilst it remains such as it is, any true conception of the mysteries of creation, much less of the countless æons by which it was preceded. And when it is stated that God speaks to man in conscience, it is yet conceded that such revelation of Himself will be more or less distinct, and more or less complete as conscience is trained by instruction or quickened in sensitiveness by moral culture.

Nor do we for a moment lose sight of the fact that the revelation of Divine truth in Holy Scripture addresses itself with very different degrees of distinctness to minds differently disposed to receive it; that it requires study, which some cannot give at all, and the great majority but most imperfectly; that its several parts stand in very varied relations to each other and to the student. Nor, on the other hand, do we

forget that the Church is comprised of men who bring into her synods the idiosyncrasies of race, of country, and of character, and who are not altogether free from temper, or prejudice, or affection. All this we are willing to acknowledge and to take account of; but, all this notwithstanding, we still assert that each is rightly invested with a just authority, which may claim to regulate both practice and opinion, an authority which is in some cases absolute, in others of legitimate weight proportionate to the circumstances and to the occasion.

Of the authority of conscience in determining philosophical modes of thought we have already spoken at such length that we shall not pursue the subject any further at present. Suffice it to say that so long as we acknowledge the existence of those moral instincts which the more thoughtful and more reasonable of sceptics themselves allow, there is at once a limit to those speculations which question or deny the existence and authority of God or the moral distinctions of right or wrong. The Atheist, the Pantheist, and the Positivist alike offend the moral instincts of our nature, and are condemned by anticipation *in foro conscientiæ*.

We turn to the later branch of our subject, the claims of Scripture and of the Church to determine or to influence religious belief.

And herein it is obvious that we limit our subject importantly as regards the section of mankind to whom this authority extends. Whilst the authority of conscience is universal, and extends to all mankind, that of Scripture and the Church reaches to Christians only, or to those to whom Christianity is offered. The authority of conscience is what Mr. Wilson would designate as 'natural;' that of Scripture and of the Church not indeed, to use his other expression, 'artificial,' but limited and to a certain extent derived.

So intimately, at least in our view, are these last two connected that it is difficult to separate absolutely between them; they are co-ordinate institutions of the grace of God, and exercise co-ordinate jurisdiction in the dispensation of that grace. They are thus connected by the closest ties. Whilst the Church is the Divinely constituted witness to Holy Scripture, and whilst to her charge are committed the oracles of God, in Holy Scripture is found the rule and measure of the Church's faith. Nor do we admit for a moment that we argue in a vicious circle when we add that they are in no small measure mutually dependent; that whilst Scripture rests greatly, though not solely, upon the testimony of the Church, the Church rests largely, but not exclusively,

upon the foundations of Scripture. Why may not two co-ordinate institutions find corroboration each in the other? Of course, were either exclusively dependent upon the testimony of the other, there would be force in the oft-repeated insinuation; but so long as both Scripture and the Church rest primarily upon their own historical evidence, their mutual corroboration is of the highest possible value, and as convincing as testimony can be. We wonder what would be said if this were wanting; if in Scripture were no history of the Church, and in the Church no witness to Scripture actually embedded in its constitution. It would be represented, and not unreasonably, as an insuperable difficulty, and the very independence of the two would be asserted to be destructive of both.

To these, their mutual relations, we shall recur by-and-by. At present let us fix our attention for a short time upon the claim of Scripture upon our acceptance and submission.

First of all it is here, and here alone, that we meet with a conception of the Divine Being and of the relations in which He stands to His creatures in any degree worthy of Him, or such as can satisfy the quickened and elevated sensibilities of the soul of man. We are ready enough to acknowledge that to this conception must belong every virtue raised to its highest pitch of excellence. We confess that to construct an ideal from the combination of all human qualities is but an anthropomorphic effort unworthy of Him whose image we would create; yet for all this before Scripture dawned upon the world mankind succeeded only in representing their deities as brutal or grotesque. They attributed immoralities instead of virtues to their divinities, or, incapable of imagining the combination of superhuman qualities, they created a separate deity for each attribute, and destroyed its beauty by its isolation. If Vulcan was superendowed with strength he certainly lacked the grace of Apollo; if Venus shone prominent in beauty, she certainly was lamentably deficient in the chastity of Diana or the intellectual brilliancy of Minerva. The religion which commenced in a deification of the powers of nature, often in the grossest form, found its consummation in a burlesque of human social life, often in an exaggeration of its vice and cruelty. The publication of Holy Scripture to the world was coincident with the decline of the empire, with the worship of Serapis, with the deification of Tiberius. Whence, then, this pure and holy conception of the Most High God, of Him that inhabiteth eternity, who is of purer eyes than to look upon iniquity? The Sermon upon the Mount

was republished to the world when Greece was sunk in infamy and Rome in blood. Whence, then, the glorious code of the Beatitudes, the sublime description of that which characterizes the saints of God, and of that which constitutes their blessedness? The Epistles were written in the days of bitter persecution, when men had given up all hope and suicide was the one solace of a philosophy which had surrendered itself to despair. Whence, then, this new hope, this faith in God, this trust in good? The annals of Tacitus are a wondrous commentary upon the Holy Scriptures, the rapture of S. Stephen's martyrdom a most strange contrast to the utter despondency in which men like Seneca opened their veins that they might die.

Or perhaps we may be told that these loftier conceptions of God, of duty, of immortality, are of 'Semitic origin,' as though the phenomenon were purely ethnological, or its cogency could be escaped by clothing it in scientific terms. But the fact is thus only re-stated; it is not explained. Why are the Hebrews thus in advance of all mankind? For if other Orientals do perhaps show some traces of more spiritual, because more abstract, conceptions of Deity, surely it will not calmly be maintained that the Hebrew Scriptures are not immeasurably in advance of their dreamy mysticism. A single passage here and there is quoted with admiration, if it bear some faint, we will not say forced, resemblance to some precept of the law or some doctrine of the Gospel; but it is not denied that God did not leave Himself without a witness even outside the limits of His special revelation. Indeed, what has been said above of the voice of God in conscience would imply so much. The nations of the world have ever been 'feeling after God, if haply they might find Him,' and often to their earnest search some glimpses of Divine light, some foretastes of Divine truth, have been vouchsafed. But flashes like these were, in comparison with the steady and progressive light of revelation, like the shooting of a meteor across a midnight sky as compared with the steady growth of day at sunrise.

But it is not only in the loftier and purer conceptions of God that the Scriptures carry the conviction of their Divine origin; it is a trite and common thing to say that they alone give a sublime yet sober estimate of man's nature and his destiny. We do not forget the hero-worship of antiquity, nor the extravagant adulation paid to some, and those by no means the most worthy, individuals of the race; but human nature gained little in the deification of strength in Hercules,

still less in the apotheosis of empire in the Cæsars. The dignity of mankind was perhaps raised to an infinitesimal extent when a few philosophers expatiated in the porch, or speculated in the grove, to conclude in a dreamy agnosticism, a cynical despair of truth. What, meanwhile, of the masses of mankind, those 'fruges consumere nati,' the poor, the slaves? One or two out of the million might wear the purple or inscribe his pedigree on marble columns, but it was Christianity which told the meanest that he was the 'child of God' and invested him with the true nobility of the Divine Image. There is doubtless a strange irony, but there is a deep significance beside, in that proud humility which emblazons its escutcheon with the Cross.

Very interesting is it to reflect upon the attitude of the human intellect in the presence of Holy Scripture. Indeed, in the instances of men of greater intellectual cultivation and activity approaching the Bible for the first time, apart from the reverential training and from that implicit acceptance which is the result of early Christian education in a Christian home, this attitude is of still greater interest, as it is of still greater difficulty. The mental powers are necessarily called upon to decide questions of authenticity and interpretation, and of that relative weight and authority of the several parts which comes under the head of the 'Proportion of Faith.' In a word, in such a case the critical faculty is first employed to test the claims of revelation and to 'try the Spirit whether it be of God;' and this task accomplished, the whole intellectual man bends in humility to accept that Divine Word upon which in certain external points it has been compelled to sit as judge. The attitude of such a mind is like that of a loyal servant who has recognized his prince in disguise, and kneels down in lowliest reverence and deepest love to do him homage. Here, and here alone, he finds the pure and holy conception of a Personal God, he meets with a standard of morals absolutely pure whilst absolutely unselfish, and finds that standard presented not alone in a code of positive commands, but in an Exemplar of surpassing excellence, such as engages the obedience of mankind not alone by the motives of a just and reasonable fear and a no less just and reasonable hope, but by those of the strongest personal love founded upon the deepest gratitude and lowliest admiration. In a single word, he is met by grace and truth in the Person of Jesus Christ. For him Scripture solves, so far as it can be solved, the great and painful mystery of sin. It offers to his faith the infinite re-

sources not of Divine Providence alone—in which, capricious and arbitrary as it appeared to them, the very heathen could repose—but those of Divine grace as well, which is yet a higher and a greater gift. Conscious as he is of an immortal spirit within him, he is here brought into the presence of the Spirit of God. For the first time does he meet with satisfaction for those 'spiritual facts of hope, and aspiration, and worship which admit of no verification but their own.'

In comparison with these its loftier attributes it is perhaps a light thing to speak of Scripture as containing maxims of the deepest practical wisdom and poetical beauties most sublime. It may seem a small thing to mention the exquisite pathos of its narratives and the tender devotion of its hymns; yet by these qualities it establishes and sustains its authority over the intellect as by the others it commands the moral and spiritual man. Cast in a form which is at the least unique in this, that it can interest the unlearned and the child, whilst it can hold captive the scholar, the philosopher, and the divine, none who surrender themselves to its influence can fail to recognize the Voice Divine.

It has, however, been the fashion, especially among recent converts to the Romish Church, to speak with something like scorn of the authority of a 'book:' as though a book even of an uninspired author were not in truth the most careful and measured utterance of the *man*, his most weighty and authoritative word; as though a man's writings did not differ from his conversation in this very particular, that whilst the one is but the reflection of his passing mood, the result of whim or accident, the other is the record of his serious thought and most deliberate conclusions.

Yet still there is, without a doubt, a marked difference, not so much in convincing as in winning and persuasive force, between the written document and the living tongue. Yet even this distinction does not hold good of works of inspiration. In these, though the human writer be dead, yet the living Spirit abides. Both as it is the Eternal Spirit which suggested, and as it is the same Spirit which interprets it, the word of God in Holy Scripture is never a 'caput mortuum.' Its essential and unalterable character is that it is the living oracle: *ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἐνεργής.* The devout student finds himself in the presence of a living Instructor. There is a power underlying the written volume which is felt to be not that of Truth alone, but of Life also. *Τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ.* And it is because the creating and informing Spirit of Holy Scripture is thus infinite and Divine that the spirit of

the learner can neither exhaust the stores of its wisdom nor yet give full expression to the deep spiritual motions which it stirs within. Who has not felt that at the very point where all verbal commentaries and illustrations fail there come in the strains of some great musician, not indeed as commensurate with Holy Scripture, but as leading the soul far beyond the regions of express thought and placing it upon the confines of that world alike of perception and of emotion which has no horizon? This is why Handel is so true an interpreter of Isaiah both in his pathos and in his majesty, and Mendelssohn of David in the deep trust of his soul and his confidence in God. This is why the strains of the Messiah are more than music, and the air 'O rest in the Lord' comes to the soul as the expression of that for which human language has no faculty of utterance.

But if Holy Scripture be indeed written in a book that book does not stand alone, but exists in necessary and enduring relation to a Living Body, the Church of the Living God. We are very anxious to state clearly what we believe to be the true relations between these two, and this because we are convinced that there never was a time when it was more important that these relations should be distinctly understood. Various unhappy circumstances have combined to envelope this subject in prejudice. The unwarrantable developments of the Church of Rome have brought discredit upon the very word 'tradition,' as though tradition in some form or other were not an inseparable condition of a historic faith; and the controversies which have gathered round this point have not failed to rouse passions little favourable to truth.

Again, it has not been sufficiently observed that *Holy Scripture was in no single portion addressed directly to the world at large*, but invariably to those in covenant with God and members of His Church; that consequently the great truths of revelation are stated rather incidentally than directly, as addressed to those who were already instructed in them by oral communication; and that therefore it became the duty of the Church to summarize and to formulate them. Thus the dictum of Chillingworth left the Protestant without a creed, and placed upon Scripture a strain which it was not constituted to bear. How lamentable the result has been in many once orthodox communities we do not care to place on record.

We would therefore lay it down as a most important truth, that whilst the Church is the Divinely constituted

witness and guardian of Scripture, in Scripture is found the rule and measure of the Church's faith. Let it not be supposed that these are loose or arbitrary terms. Holy Scripture supplies the rule by which the faith is to be regulated, and the measure by which, as necessary to salvation, it is to be limited; but, on the other hand, it is not, except in a very qualified sense, the source from which it is originally derived. Written documents were not the original mode of the Divine communications to the Church or to the world. It was to the Church that the successive revelations of His Being and His Will were primarily addressed by Almighty God, and that by the living agency of inspired men, whether patriarchs, lawgivers, prophets, or apostles. Holy Scripture embodies and transmits these revelations, and with them she incorporates the history of that Church in its development from an individual into a family and nation, as the guardian and depository of the truths thus progressively revealed. Hence, among other causes, arises the varied structure of Holy Scripture, and the confessedly different relations in which its several parts stand to the soul of man. The often-disputed question whether the Bible 'be' or 'contain' the Word of God arises really from forgetfulness of the difference in these relations. The writings of prophets, evangelists, and apostles convey that very revelation which it has pleased God to make. The historians of Scripture convey the history of that Church which was the depository of the truth, in which history is found the guarantee of the authenticity of the revelation. No one will suppose that the books of Numbers and of Esther stand in the same relation to the soul of man as the Gospel of S. John or the Epistles of S. Paul, nor that a man's faith is affected in the same way by each. But the books of Numbers and of Esther stand in very important relation to those spiritual truths which immediately and vitally affect the soul; they are the history of the casket in which the jewel was enshrined, and that history is preserved to us in the special providence and care of God. It may be a matter of small importance to the individual Christian whether the length of the court of the tabernacle was an hundred cubits, nor is he specially interested in the succession of courses of the priesthood; but it is of the greatest importance to him to know that both under Moses and under Solomon provision was made for the continuous worship of Almighty God, and for the maintenance of sacrifice and offering in perpetual anticipation of the one true Sacrifice by the one great High Priest. The number of the armies of David or the years of

Hezekiah may seem trivial circumstances in a Divine record; but it is a matter of most serious interest to know how was maintained the continuity of that Church and kingdom in which Isaiah prophesied and the Psalmists sung. Nor is it to be forgotten how much the historical narrative and the spiritual instruction interpenetrate each other, and how the deepest truths are frequently conveyed in that concrete form of personal story which is most readily apprehended by the masses of mankind.

Such, then, on the whole, and broadly speaking, is the constitution of Scripture which is the Church's heritage. The Church, thus armed and thus instructed, God first maintained in a certain isolation in the world's midst—an isolation essential to the purity of its growth—and then sent it forth into the world to proclaim that truth which hitherto it had retained enshrined in its own bosom. Then did the Christian Church appear among mankind, the creation of a miraculous history, equipped with miraculous powers, in possession of supernatural truth. They who went forth thus, 'preaching the kingdom,' were themselves inspired men; and their inspiration was attested by their supernatural powers. They were the descendants of a lofty lineage. Prophets and patriarchs, 'the friends of God,' had been their forefathers, and had transmitted to them the precious heritage of the faith. The golden chain had stretched in bright links throughout the world's history from Abraham to S. John, and was now complete in the revelation of the Son of God.

It was not then, we repeat, from inspired writings, but from inspired men, that the Church, whether Christian or Jewish, first received her doctrine. And this doctrine, thus received, she diffused by living agency, transmitting it by oral teaching, by liturgical acts, by creeds, by her ministerial succession, and above all by the unbroken testimony of her sacraments. But simultaneously with all these varied methods of transmission she has ever carried in her hand the Holy Scriptures as the rule and measure of that truth which she was commissioned to teach.

It is to this co-ordinate authority of Scripture and the Church that we would urge that no scant or grudging measure of allegiance is due. Not to the members of the Church of England alone would we commend this authority as a guide, but indeed to all who in this our land are painfully searching for truth and sorely vexed by the intellectual perplexities of the day. We desire to deal with this subjec in no frigid or pedantic spirit. We can understand tha

hopeful enthusiasm for which the freest speculation has the greatest charms, to which thought is attractive in proportion as it is daring, and for which in this, as in other fields of adventure, danger is a leading element of fascination. Still more deeply can we sympathize with the tender and affectionate spirit which clings to the traditions of the past and is won by all that woos in the name of antiquity. But the issues here are far too important to be left to mere feeling to choose, or to the chance proclivities of intellectual taste to decide. Too often have we seen the keen and self-reliant enthusiasm which had launched itself without chart or compass upon the wide sea of speculation return with sails drooping and spars broken, despairing of the truth which it had failed to discover. Too often, on the other hand, has it been shown by sad experience that religious convictions require to rest upon more solid foundations than those of sentiment in an age of scepticism. In fact, alike in the one case and the other, the mind requires something definite and tangible to grasp. Antiquity is a term well-nigh as vague as speculation itself. It floats through fifteen centuries at least, and ranges from S. Clement to the latest of the schoolmen. Thus in its very grandeur it vanishes into a shadow; in addition to which, whilst all which harmonizes with our taste or appeals to our judgment may very properly influence our opinions, that which is to exercise authority must show somewhat of right, for it claims not only to influence but to control.

Now, the scope and comprehensiveness of Scripture is happily not difficult to determine. No practical inquirer for truth need distress himself with questions of authenticity, nor embarrass himself at starting with the settlement of the canon. The literary history of isolated passages, or even of a single book, will not substantially affect the foundations of his faith; nor, with regard to important doctrines, need he be perplexed by variations either of readings or of translations. Yet the student will undoubtedly feel that the leading articles of the faith, though abundantly implied, are yet but seldom explicitly stated, and scarcely ever, if at all, scientifically formulated. The explanation has been already suggested. Those to whom Scripture was given were already orally instructed; and it is an absolute necessity of catechetical instruction that the truths thus taught should have been formulated to their hands. It is impossible to conceive them otherwise taught or otherwise learned. Do then, we naturally ask, these formulated statements actually remain to us? If

they do they will determine the true sense of Scripture, and they will themselves be illustrated, amplified, and at the same time limited by Scripture.

The answer is plain. We have them first of all, and most explicitly, in the primitive creeds—in the Apostles', the Nicene, and though perhaps not with such formal authentication, yet certainly as representing the primitive faith, in the doctrinal portions of the Athanasian Creed. We find them next—as, should opportunity offer, we hope to show on another occasion—in the two great sacraments of the Gospel, maintained in unbroken continuity and embodying in distinct acts unintermitting testimony to Christian doctrine. We find them accordingly in the most ancient liturgies, and more particularly in those most interesting fragments of liturgical formularies embedded here and there in the Epistles of S. Paul; as, for example, in certain well-known doxologies, and in those πίστοι λόγοι which occur so remarkably in the pastoral Epistles. Nay, we are not in truth straining the case if we add the testimony of the catacombs, the language of rude symbol and untutored painting, in which antiquity speaks in perhaps her most pathetic accents. It was this combination, if we may not rather say this identity of primitive faith with Scriptural statement, which formed the ideal to which the Church of England strove to return at the Reformation. The religious aspect of that movement has been much obscured by the personal and political character of the successive governments under which it was effected, and still more seriously by the iconoclastic violence of the Puritan movement which succeeded. We are convinced that the unmeasured vituperation of such a work as Mr. Ward's once famous *Ideal* was founded largely upon misconception, and would have been obviated by a more patient investigation of the religious history of the sixteenth and preceding centuries. It would have been found that the principles upon which the English Church was re-settled were very far removed from those of the Puritan faction, which were, in fact, no other than the dictum of Chillingworth carried out to its extreme consequences. In the liturgy as in the constitution of the Church of England it is impossible not to recognize a most conscientious effort to conform to primitive models, as, for example, in the return—for such it was—to the vernacular, in the restoration of the cup to the laity; above all, in the embodiment in the liturgy of the true doctrine of the sacraments, the real gift of regeneration in baptism, the real conveyance of the grace of the Body and Blood of Christ in the

Eucharist, notwithstanding all the pressure which must from time to time have been brought to bear in an opposite direction.[1] Surely this marked conformity in great doctrines and on great principles is not materially affected by the transposition of a sentence or a change in the accessories of worship.

Nor can we refrain from noticing here an obligation which we owe to the compilers of our liturgy which will, we are convinced, be recognized much more distinctly hereafter than at present. We refer to the fact that these great truths are there expressed mainly in the majestic simplicity of Scriptural language rather than, as, humanly speaking, might so easily have happened, in the terms of a metaphysical philosophy, terms which themselves tend rapidly to become obsolete as the philosophical system itself shall change or pass away. A difficulty might very conceivably have arisen analogous to that which at the present moment would have been so grievously felt, had the Church been committed to a physical system of the universe or to a special theory of inspiration. We do not think that this point has received as yet by any means the attention which it deserves, though the general subject was referred to in a brief but very striking speech by the Bishop of Peterborough at the Church Congress at Leicester, 1880.

It will be observed that the views here propounded are wholly at variance with any system of doctrinal development, *i.e.* of development within the Church of doctrine as distinguished from opinion. That there must be a constant development of opinion, that even doctrinal statements must vary even as philosophical systems and modes of thought vary, is obvious. New theories will arise; old theories will either disappear or adapt themselves to new circumstances; the spiritual conceptions of a cultivated age will differ essentially from those of a barbarous one, as the sunlight will be refracted in different colours as falling through different media; but the sunlight is not changed, nor are the truths of revelation changed. They are immutable and eternal. If the Romish Communion has defined such doctrines as those of

[1] We cannot refrain from quoting some remarkable words of Cardinal Newman (*Parochial Sermons*, vol. iii.) on the visible Church. 'If a man looks into the Prayer Book he will meet there with names about which he knows and cares nothing at all. A prayer we read daily is called the prayer of S. Chrysostom; a creed is called the Creed of S. Athanasius; another creed is called the Nicene Creed. In the Articles we read of S. Augustine and S. Jerome, in the Homilies of many such beside.'

the Immaculate Conception, the Papal Supremacy, &c., and have constituted these definitions *de fide*, it seems to us that she has manifestly exceeded her powers and strained authority beyond its just limits. If our estimate of the Church's office as the witness and custodian of truth be correct, her authority to impose articles *de fide* must be limited to that faith which the Apostles taught and which the Apostolic Church received, or at the least cannot extend beyond the immediate and most necessary deductions. The results of the recent policy of the Church of Rome have yet to be seen. We imagine that they are contemplated with no small apprehension by some of her wisest leaders.

But to return to our own Church. The position which she has in our opinion so wisely taken in this respect supplies no inconsiderable answer to an argument which a recent article in a popular periodical has put forward in the interests of infidelity, and which was used, if we are not mistaken, by Mr. Mallock in his book *Is Life Worth Living?* in the interests of Romanism.

'If,' says Mr. Kegan Paul, 'you are unwilling to accept the extreme dogmas of the Church of Rome, how can you consistently accept the not less mysterious doctrines of the Christian faith?' 'If,' on the other hand, argues Mr. Mallock, 'you are willing to bend the intellect to faith, and to accept the mysteries of revelation, why do you not go further and, by a like submission, accept the not more mysterious doctrines of the Church of Rome?' We say nothing of the moral character of such a dilemma. To us the argument, in whichever direction it is pressed, seems much worse than illogical: it is a cruel attempt to wreck men's faith upon the horns of an unsound dilemma. But the argument is fallacious, and the dilemma is apparent only. It is true that Scripture and the primitive faith involve certain mysteries which confessedly transcend our reason; but they come to us on the strength of a revelation contained in written documents, contemporaneous with the inspired men who taught them and whose inspiration was attested by their lives and by their miracles. Subsequent ages have added other dogmas by way either of development or accretion. Of many of these it cannot be said that they are primitive, as it cannot be said that they are Scriptural. They rest upon a later and a different authority, which we may term ecclesiastical; but even so not upon the authority of the undivided Church. It is then argued that a man must either be a Romanist and accept all, or an infidel and reject all. This is maintained, as we have said, on the

one hand in the interests of Rome, on the other in those of infidelity. It is a dilemma to which the Ultramontanists have endeavoured to reduce Continental society, and with success; only that society has embraced the alternative for which the Ultramontanist was unprepared, and has become infidel instead of Romanist. But this is illogical of society, which ought to have seen that to receive a Divine mystery upon evidence Divinely authenticated is quite a different thing from receiving an ecclesiastical mystery upon no proper evidence at all. What may be the effects of such a strain placed upon authority in the Vatican Council time alone will show; but the indications which are already discernible in the condition of Continental society are not in any degree encouraging.

Surely we have reason to be thankful that the Church of England has imposed no such dilemma upon the thought of the nation. If she err at present it certainly is not in the direction of excessive stringency. The terms of subscription for her clergy are as free as is consistent with any *bonâ fide* adherence to primitive doctrine, whilst the terms of communion for her laity are those of the Nicene Creed. The doctrinal statements of her liturgical offices are for the most part in the express words of Scripture, or such as are demonstrable from Scripture as read in the light of primitive antiquity. So far as they are otherwise she does not impose them as *de fide*. At the same time there are few, if any, important doctrinal questions upon which her views are not distinctly known. Upon such points of doctrine or of practice as have not arisen subsequent to her reconstitution at the Reformation her voice is abundantly explicit to guide thought, to teach, to influence, to direct opinion; but beyond those truths which she holds upon no insufficient evidence to constitute the primitive revelation of God she does not presume to *bind* men's consciences. Doubtless there will not be wanting some who fain would have it otherwise, who will sigh for an authority at once more stringent and more comprehensive; to whom the labour of thought is painful, whilst the attitude of suspense is distressing in the extreme; to whom it would seem like an inexpressible relief to surrender once for all the right, and to escape for ever the responsibility of thought. In the interest of such we may have a word by-and-by. We are not optimists. We do not hold that the position of the Church of England with respect to what we may call secondary, though most important, truths is by any means satisfactory; but as to the eternal verities of the faith we do maintain that neither is her utterance indistinct nor her authority obscure.

Meanwhile we are looking forward to a struggle such as human society has not seen for many a year, certainly not since the closing decade of the last century, nor in England even then. The struggle will be not between opposing views of Christian truth, not between rival sects or Churches, but between faith and no faith, between Christianity and Atheism itself. The feud is deadly, and internecine will be the strife. Surely it is our wisdom to concentrate our forces, and it may be, for a season, even to contract our frontier. But above all is it necessary that we carefully reconnoitre our position, and ascertain distinctly the authority which we follow and in virtue of which, in turn, we claim to lead. On the Continent, in France, in Italy, the war has already commenced. Infidelity has allied itself with democracy, and democracy has been only too ready to accept the alliance. How plaintive, yet how unavailing, are the appeals which each day brings from the See of Rome to the Powers of Europe by the re-establishment of authority to reconstitute society! Alas! the very principle of authority has been strained till it threatens utterly to give way. The contest is carried on at a terrible disadvantage, from the utter confusion which prevails in the Roman Communion as to the seat and the limits of authority and its relations to intellect and conscience. The encyclical of Pius IX. and the Vatican decrees are powerless to settle these relations. They have practically decided nothing: their decisions fall upon hearts that are unmoved and upon minds that are unconvinced. The Church comes into the fray weighted with a mass of mediævalism which checks and encumbers her at every move. She is like the stripling David clad in Saul's armour, but she dares not throw it aside. Yet who does not see the freedom and the strength which she would gain would she return to the position of the Nicæan fathers, enforcing that only as of faith which they 'received from the Church and proved from Scripture,' standing upon the impregnable foundation of primitive doctrine and of the Word of God?[1]

'Although Christ,' said the Council of Constance, 'instituted the Sacrament in both kinds and the primitive Church retained the same method of administering it, yet *these things*

[1] We quote the words of the late Provost of Oriel. His was a mind, it may be, too strictly accurate and measured in thought enthusiastically to lead mankind, but on that very account well qualified to instruct them. Those who best knew him can testify to that kindness and unfailing liberality which no less strongly marked his character than did the calm, measured intellect, so judicially exact alike in thought and in expression.

notwithstanding, tamen hoc non obstante . . . .' Daring words, and terrible to reflect upon. Yet who that knows the history of the Council of Constance will not feel that their dread Nemesis yet hangs like a dark cloud over the hosts of battle? Let the Church but take her stand upon the distinct ground of the Divine revelation, and the ultimate victory is assured. It is a trite maxim, 'Magna est veritas.' But of all truth none is so great as the truth of God: against that it is that the gates of hell shall not prevail.

Let us not be misunderstood. We do not counsel the surrender of a single truth; we do not urge the sacrifice of one cherished conviction. There are doctrines not directly included in the creeds which the Church of Christ holds with scarcely less affection, and for which her children have been willing to suffer persecution. The question is not whether she shall surrender these, or whether her children shall cease to hold them, or her clergy cease to teach them; but whether she shall impose them as *de fide*, make them terms of communion, or exact them as essential to the faith. Yet with respect to these, which we may term secondary truths, the Church has both a right and a duty, and it is right that her voice should be distinctly heard. For it is her province not only to lay down the essential articles of faith, but to guide opinion, to educate thought, and to set true and sound views of spiritual mysteries before mankind. She will thus have a distinctive theology, having regard to the genius of her children and to the subjects and modes of thought current at any given time. In the sixteenth century the Church of England had to speak on many subjects of secondary importance which yet pressed severely upon men's consciences and most closely affected the wellbeing of society. The lawfulness of an oath, the right of a Christian man to separate property, the lawfulness of the marriage of the clergy, were a few among many points which at that time agitated men's minds to an extent which now we can hardly realize. The Church was bound to speak, and to speak authoritatively, upon such topics, though not perhaps justified in making them conditions of communion. Time passes on. The centres of interest are displaced. Few question at present the lawfulness of property or of a judicial oath. Other questions arise, not unattended by new dangers: questions of doctrine, questions of ritual, questions of Church government. Men look to the Church for direction; the crisis arrives, perhaps passes away. The Church is silent, to the great detriment of her authority. She has no voice, no legitimate organ for the expression of

her will or of her convictions. Men act as best they may, in accordance with their interpretation of laws which, from their very age, are often obsolete, always obscure. They are tried for contumacy, and punished with a severity manifestly disproportionate to the offence. Hence arise entanglements of most disastrous kind. And what is the cause? Surely it is that the Church's voice is silenced, that in all the reviving energy of her new vigour she is perforce dumb. Our rulers civil, and it may be ecclesiastical, were afraid, perhaps still fear, that if the Church were allowed free action in her synods, theological disquiet, incessant disputation, the interminable contest of opinions must ensue. What has been the result? There has been more than once much danger of solitude, but has there been peace? In fact, the ecclesiastical machine has been thrown rudely out of gear. Responsibility has constantly been cast upon the wrong shoulders. Law courts, if they have not been compelled to act as legislators, have had to incur the suspicion and obloquy of a false position. Bishops have been placed in no more enviable a position. They have been compelled perpetually to counsel moderation, to urge compromise, to strain authority, in the vain effort to persuade men deeply, it may be unreasonably, earnest in their convictions to acquiesce in a condition of things possible only in a state of torpor. What the Church wished was to be awake—to discuss, to examine, *to decide for herself.* Why should she not legislate for the nineteenth as she had done for the sixteenth century and for the centuries before? No doubt divergencies of opinion would find expression in an ecclesiastical council. They certainly found abundant methods of expression in the abeyance of that council. But in regularly constituted synods they would be controlled by precedent, governed by prescription, and, what is more important still, solemnized and moderated by the sense of responsibility. In irregular warfare the tactics are greatly in the hands of the undisciplined and untrained, whilst in a regularly constituted force the authority and the management will naturally vest in the officers of the highest rank and of the greatest experience. It is time, then, that the Church recover that authority which can attach only to the free expression of her will. There is little danger that in a body constituted like the Church of England prescription will not carry its full weight, unless, indeed, the legislative power be so long delayed that her organization becomes shaken and the temper of her members embittered. That the reconstitution of Convocation would involve many diffi-

culties, that the newly constituted bodies would require wise direction and the leadership of trained and statesmanlike minds—this is obvious enough. But the Church of England has still strength enough successfully to encounter difficulties, and leaders of wise, calm, and statesmanlike capacity have never been wanting in the number of her prelates.

> 'Sed nos immensum spatiis confecimus æquor,
> Et jam tempus equûm fumantia solvere colla.'

If any ask to what authority we absolutely defer in the essential articles of the Christian faith, our answer is, to the co-ordinate and correlative authority of Holy Scripture and of primitive antiquity. If further asked to what guidance we would turn for direction in arriving at sound conclusions in respect of matters of infinite interest, and it may be of vast importance, though not strictly *de fide*, we turn a reverent and docile ear to the voice of the Church Catholic wherever that may be heard, but more especially to that of our own branch of that Church in her formularies and in our great divines; whilst for that Church we do claim, and as a matter of most urgent need, the power of freely expressing her convictions and her will through the constitutional organs of her synods.

How these may be reconstituted; what voice may be given to the laity; how the different orders of the clergy shall obtain or shall secure their proportionate influence; what shall still remain the legitimate authority of the Crown: these are indeed problems which will be solved only by wise and experienced heads. Let us add, with all respect, they will never be solved by faint or desponding hearts.

ART. VI.—BISHOP THIRLWALL.

1. *Remains, Literary and Theological, of Connop Thirlwall, late Lord Bishop of S. David's.* Edited by J. J. STEWART PEROWNE, D.D. Vol. 1 : Charges delivered between the years 1842 and 1860. Vol. 2 : Charges delivered between the years 1863 and 1872. 8vo. (London, 1877.)
2. *Essays, Speeches, and Sermons.* By CONNOP THIRLWALL, D.D., late Lord Bishop of S. David's. Edited by J. J. STEWART PEROWNE, D.D. 8vo. (London, 1880.)
3. *Letters to a Friend.* By CONNOP THIRLWALL, late Lord Bishop of S. David's. Edited by the Very Rev. ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D. 8vo. (London, 1881.)
4. *Letters, Literary and Theological, of Connop Thirlwall, late Lord Bishop of S. David's.* Edited by the Very Rev. J. J. STEWART PEROWNE, D.D., Dean of Peterborough, and the Rev. LOUIS STOKES, B.A., Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. With Annotations and Preliminary Memoirs by the Rev. LOUIS STOKES. 8vo. (London, 1881.)
5. *Letters to a Friend.* New Edition. (London, 1882.)

THE friends of Bishop Thirlwall have done scant justice to his memory. The list of works which we have placed at the head of our article shows that three persons have been employed either in editing such of his works as it was thought proper to republish, or in recounting some few particulars of a life which ought, we think, to have been related with greater detail and a more lucid arrangement of materials. We are told by Dean Perowne that 'the Bishop's life was not an eventful life.' It certainly was not, in the ordinary sense of the word, eventful. A biography which relates the ever-changing incidents of a bustling career, spiced with good stories and more or less indiscreet revelations of matters hitherto kept secret, is doubtless a very entertaining, and in a certain sense valuable, production. We think, however, that the narrative of such a life as Bishop Thirlwall's might, in good hands, have been made more valuable and quite as entertaining. It is true that he rarely quitted his peaceful retreat at Abergwili; but, paradoxical as it sounds, he was no recluse. He took part in spirit, if not in bodily presence, in all the important events, political, religious, and literary, of

[illegible] Bishop [illegible] as for [illegible] and his [illegible] not [illegible] that [illegible] and impartial' [illegible] the [illegible] of the [illegible] editor [illegible] should [illegible] and should have [illegible] in the [illegible] duties [illegible] Again, [illegible] We can [illegible] in a [illegible] and many for [illegible] them in their proper [illegible] They deal with a distinct class of [illegible] this [illegible] elucidate many points left [illegible] published in the following year, and [illegible] have been intended as the final *Life and* [illegible] His life as we understand the word, [illegible] and we fear death has removed most of [illegible] perform the task in a manner worthy of the [illegible] Ourselves, all that we propose to do is to try to [illegible] and his character, by the help of the [illegible] before us, and of such personal recollections as we [illegible] able to gather together.

Connop Thirlwall was born February 11, 1797. His father, the Rev. Thomas Thirlwall, minister of Tavistock Chapel, Broad Court, Long Acre, Lecturer of S. Dunstan, Stepney, and chaplain to the celebrated Thomas Percy, Lord Bishop of Dromore, resided at Mile End. We can give no information about him except the above list of his preferments; and of Connop's mother we only know that her husband describes her as 'pious and virtuous,' and anxious to 'promote the temporal and eternal welfare' of her children. She had the satisfaction of living long enough to see her son a bishop.[1] Connop must have been a fearfully precocious child. In 1809 the fond father published a small duodecimo volume entitled '*Primitiæ; or, Essays and Poems on Various Subjects, Religious, Moral, and Entertaining.* By Connop Thirlwall, eleven years of age.' The first of these essays is dated 'June 30, 1804. Seven years old;' and in the preface the father tells us—

'In the short sketch which I shall take of the young author, and his performance, I mean not to amuse the reader with anecdotes of extraordinary precocity of genius; it is, however, but justice to him to state, that at a very *early* period he read English so well that he was taught Latin at three years of age, and at four read Greek with an ease and fluency which astonished all who heard him. From that time he has continued to improve himself in the knowledge of the Greek, Latin, French, and English languages. His talent for composition appeared at the age of seven, from an accidental circumstance. His mother, in my absence, desired his elder brother to write his thoughts upon a subject for his improvement, when the young author took it into his head to ask her permission to take the pen in hand too. His request was of course complied with, without the most remote idea he could write an intelligible sentence, when in a short time he composed that which is first printed, "On the Uncertainty of Life." From that time he was encouraged to cultivate a talent of which he gave so flattering a promise, and generally on a Sunday chose a subject from Scripture. The following essays are selected from those lucubrations.'

We will quote a passage from one of these childish sermons, written when he was eight years old. The text selected is, 'Behold, I will add unto thy days fifteen years' (Isaiah xiii. 6); and, after some commonplaces on the condition of Hezekiah, the author takes occasion from the day, January 1, 1806, to make the following reflections:—

'I shall now consider what resolutions we ought to form at the beginning of a new year. The intention of God in giving us life was

[1] *Letters*, &c., p. 177.

that we might live a life of righteousness. The same ever is His intention in preserving it. We ought, then, to live in righteousness and obey the commandments of God. Do we not perceive that another year is come, that time is passing away quickly, and eternity is approaching? and shall we be all this while in a state of sin, without any recollection that the kingdom of heaven is nearer at hand? But we ought, in the beginning of a new year, to form a resolution to be more mindful of the great account we must give at the last day, and live accordingly: we ought to form a resolution to reform our lives, and walk in the ways of God's righteousness; to abhor all the lusts of the flesh, and to live in temperance; and resolve no more to offend and provoke God with our sins, but repent of them. In the beginning of a new year we should reflect a little: although we are kept alive, yet many died in the course of last year; and this ought to make us watchful.'

There is not much originality of thought in this; indeed, it is impossible to avoid the suspicion that the paternal sermons, to which the author doubtless listened every Sunday, suggested the form, and possibly the matter, of these essays. What meaning could a child of eight attach to such expressions as 'the lusts of the flesh,' or 'repentance,' or 'eternity'? Still, notwithstanding this evident imitation of others in the matter, the style has a remarkable individuality. Indeed, just as the portrait of the child which is prefixed to the volume recalls forcibly the features of the veteran Bishop at seventy years of age, we fancy that we can detect in the style a foreshadowing of some of the qualities which rendered that of the man so remarkable. There is the same orderly arrangement of what he has to say, the same absence of rhetoric, the same logical deduction of the conclusion from the premisses. As we turn over the pages we are struck by the extent of reading which the allusions suggest. The best English authors, the most famous men of antiquity, are quoted as if the writer were familiar with them. The themes, too, are singularly varied. We find 'An Eastern Tale,' which, though redolent of *Rasselas*, is not devoid of originality and has considerable power of description; an 'Address' delivered to the Worshipful Company of Drapers at their annual visit to Bancroft's School, which is not more fulsome than such compositions usually are; and, lastly, half a dozen poems, which are by far the best things in the book. Let us take, almost at random, a few lines from the last: 'Characters often Seen, but little Marked: a Satire.' A young lady, called Clara, is anxious to break off a match, and lays her plot in the following fashion:—

'The marriage eve arrived: she chanced to meet
The unsuspecting lover in the street;
Begins an artful, simple tale to tell.
"I'm glad to see your future spouse so well,
But I just heard—" "What?" cries the curious swain.
"You may not like it; I must not explain."
"What was the dear, delusive creature at?"
"Oh! nothing, nothing, only private chat."
"A pack of nonsense! it cannot be true!
"As if, dear girl, she could be false to you!"'

Here, again, there may not be much originality of thought, but the versification is excellent, and the whole piece of surprising merit, when we reflect that it was written by a child. Yet, whatever may be the worth of this and other pieces in the volume before us as a promise of future greatness, we cannot but pity the poor little fellow, stimulated by the inconsiderate vanity of his parents to a priggish affectation of teaching others when he ought to have been either learning himself or at play with his schoolfellows; and we can thoroughly sympathize with the Bishop's feelings respecting the book. The lady to whom the *Letters to a Friend* were written had evidently asked him for a copy, and obtained the following answer:—

'I am sure that if you knew the point in my foot which gives me pain you would not select that to kick or tread upon; and I am equally sure that if you had been aware of the intense loathing with which I think of the subject of your note you would not have recalled it to my mind. When Mrs. P——, in the simplicity of her heart, and no doubt believing it to be an agreeable subject to me, told me at dinner on Thursday that she possessed the hated volume, it threw a shade over my enjoyment of the evening, and it was with a great effort that, after a pause, I could bring myself to resume the conversation. If I could buy up every copy for the flames, without risk of a reprint, I should hardly think any price too high. Let me entreat you never again to remind me of its existence.'[1]

In 1809 young Thirlwall was sent as a day scholar to the Charterhouse, the choice of a school having very likely been determined by the fact that his father resided at the east end of London. The records of his school days are provokingly incomplete; nay, almost a blank. We should like to know whether he was ever a boy in the ordinary sense of the word; whether he ever played at games,[2] or got into mischief, or

[1] *Letters to a Friend*, p. 155.

[2] Dean Perowne mentions (Preface, p. viii.) that 'at school he did not care to enter into the games and amusements of the other boys, but was to be seen at play-hour withdrawing himself into some corner with a pile of books under his arm.'

obtained the distinction of a flogging. As far as his studies were concerned, he was fortunate in going to the Charterhouse when that excellent scholar Dr. Raine was head master, and in being the contemporary of several boys who afterwards distinguished themselves, among whom may be specially mentioned his life-long friend Julius Charles Hare, and George Grote, with whom, in after years, he was to be united by an identity of literary work. His chief friend, however, at this period was not one of his schoolfellows, but a young man named John Candler,[1] a Quaker, resident at Ipswich. Several of the letters addressed to him during the four years spent at Charterhouse have fortunately been preserved. When we remember that these were written between the ages of twelve and sixteen, they must be regarded as possessing extraordinary merit. They are studied and rather stilted compositions, evidently the result of much thought and labour, as was usual in days when postage cost eightpence; but they reveal a wonderfully wide extent of reading, and an interest in passing events not usual in so ardent a student as the writer evidently had even then become. Young Candler was 'a friend to liberty' and an admirer of Sir Francis Burdett. His correspondent criticizes the popular hero and the mob, who, 'after having broken the ministerial windows and pelted the soldiers with brickbats, have gone quietly home and left him to his meditations upon Tower Hill,' with much severity. Most thoughtful boys are fond of laying down the lines of their future life in their letters to their schoolfellows; but how few there are who do not change their opinions utterly, and end by adopting some profession wholly different from that which at first attracted them! This was not the case with Thirlwall. We find him writing at twelve years old in terms which he would not have disdained at fifty. 'I shall never be a bigot in politics,' he says; 'whither my reason does not guide me I will suffer myself to be led by the nose by no man.'[2] 'I would ask the advocates for confining learning to the breasts of the wealthy and the noble, in whose breasts are the seeds of sedition and discontent most easily sown? In that of the unenlightened or well-informed peasant? In that of a man incapable of

[1] Candler was seven years older than Thirlwall. He was junior assistant in a draper's shop at Ipswich, and afterwards set up in business on his own account at Chelmsford, where he became a leading member of the Society of Friends. He died, nearly eighty years of age, in 1872. We have not been able to ascertain how he became acquainted with Thirlwall.

[2] *Letters*, &c., p. 7.

judging either of the disadvantages of his station or the means of ameliorating it? . . . These were long since my sentiments.'[1] And, lastly, on the burning question of Parliamentary Reform: 'Party prejudice must own it rather contradictory to reason and common sense that a population of one hundred persons should have two representatives, while four hundred thousand are without one. These are abuses which require speedy correction.'[2] He had evidently been taken to see Cambridge, and was constantly looking forward to his residence there. His anticipations, however, were not wholly agreeable. At that time he did not care much for classics. He thought that they were not 'objects of such infinite importance that the most valuable portion of man's life, the time which he passes at school and at college, should be devoted to them.' In after-life he said that he had been 'injudiciously plied with Horace at the Charterhouse,' and that, in consequence, 'many years elapsed before I could enjoy the most charming of Latin poets.'[3] He admits, however, that he is looking forward 'with hope and pleasing anticipation to the time when I shall immure myself' at Cambridge; and he makes some really admirable reflections, most unusual at that period, on University distinctions and the use to be made of them.

'There is one particular in which I hope to differ from many of those envied persons who have attained to the most distinguished academical honours. Several of these seem to have considered the years which they have spent at the University not as the time of preparation for studies of a severer nature, but as the term of their labours, the completion of which is the signal for a life of indolence, dishonourable to themselves and unprofitable to mankind. Literature and science are thus degraded from their proper rank as the most dignified occupations of a rational being, and are converted into instruments for procuring the gratification of our sensual appetites. This will not, I trust, be the conduct of your friend. Sorry indeed should I be to accept the highest honours of the University were I from that time destined to sink into an obscure and useless inactivity.'[4]

An English translation of the *Pensées de Pascal* had fallen in his way; and, in imitation of that great thinker, he had formed a resolution, of which he begs his friend to remind him in future years, to devote himself wholly to such studies (among others to the acquisition of a knowledge of Hebrew)

[1] *Letters*, &c., p. 17. [2] *Ibid.* p. 8. [3] *Letters to a Friend*, p. 225.
[4] *Letters*, &c., p. 21. The letter is dated December, 1813, when the writer was sixteen years old.

as would fit him for the clerical profession. We shall see that he never really faltered from these intentions; for, though he was at one time beset with doubts as to his fitness to perform the practical duties of a clergyman, he was from first to last a theologian, and only admitted other studies as ancillary to that central object.

Thirlwall left Charterhouse in December 1813, and proceeded to Trinity College, Cambridge, in October of the following year. How he spent the interval has not been recorded—probably, like many other boys educated at a purely classical school, in doing his best to acquire an adequate knowledge of mathematics, to his deficiency in which there are frequent references. He was so far successful in his efforts that he obtained the place of 22nd senior optime in 1818, when he proceeded in due course to his degree. Meanwhile, however great his distaste for the classics might have been at school, he had risen to high distinction in them; for he obtained the Craven University scholarship when only a freshman, as well as the Bell scholarship, and in the year of his degree the first Chancellor's medal.[1] In the autumn of the same year he was elected Fellow of his college. It is provoking to have to admit that our record of what may be termed the first part of his Cambridge career must begin and end here. Of the second portion, when he returned to his college and became assistant tutor, we shall have plenty to say hereafter; but of his undergraduate days no record has been preserved. He had the good fortune to enter his college when the society there was exceptionally brilliant; among his contemporaries were Sedgwick, Whewell, the two Waddingtons, his old friend Hare, who gained a Fellowship in the same year as himself, and many others who contributed to make that period of University history a golden age. We can imagine him in their company 'moulding high thought in colloquy serene,' and taking part in anything which might develop the general culture of the place; but beyond the facts that he was secretary to the Union Society in 1817, when the 'debate was interrupted by the entrance of the proctors, who laid on its members the commands of the Vice-Chancellor to disperse, and on no account to resume their dis-

[1] Professor Monk, who had examined Thirlwall on one of these occasions, was so much struck with the vigour and accuracy of his translations that he remarked to a friend, who had also had experience of his worth as a scholar, 'Had I been sitting in my library, with unlimited access to books, I could not have done better.' 'Nor so well,' was the reply.

cussions,'[1] and that he had acquired a high reputation for eloquence as a speaker there,[2] we know nothing definite about him. He does not appear to have made any new friends; but as Julius Hare was in residence during the same period as he was, the two doubtless saw much of each other; and it is probably to him that Thirlwall owed the love of Wordsworth which may be detected in some of his letters, his fondness for metaphysical speculation, and his wish to learn German. The only letters preserved are addressed to his old correspondent Mr. Candler, and to his uncle Mr. John Thirlwall, and they give us no information special to Cambridge. He dwells on his fondness for ancient history, on his preference for that of Greece over that of Rome; he records the addition of the Italian and German languages to his stock of acquirements; and describes with enthusiasm his yearning for foreign travel, which each year grew stronger.

'I certainly was not made to sit at home in contented ignorance of the wonders of art and nature, nor can I believe that the restlessness of curiosity I feel was implanted in my disposition to be a source of uneasiness rather than enjoyment. Under this conviction I peruse the authors of France and Italy, with the idea that the language I am now reading I may one day be compelled to speak, and that what is now a source of elegant and refined entertainment may be one day the medium through which I shall disclose my wants and obtain a supply of the necessaries of life. This is the most enchanting of my day dreams; it has been for some years past my inseparable companion. And, apt as are my inclinations to fluctuate, I cannot recollect this to have ever undergone the slightest abatement.'[3]

The letter from which we have selected the above passage was written to his uncle in 1816; in another, written a few months later to his friend Mr. Candler, he enters more fully into his difficulties and prospects. The earlier portion of the

[1] Cooper's *Annals of the Town and University of Cambridge*, iv. 516. The words between inverted commas in our text are from a pamphlet entitled 'A Statement regarding the Union, an Academical Debating Society, which existed at Cambridge from February 13, 1815, to March 24, 1817, when it was *suppressed by the Vice-Chancellor*.' The 'statement' is evidently official, and is thoroughly business-like and temperate. The Vice-Chancellor was Dr. Wood, Master of S. John's College; the officers of the society were: Mr. Whewell, *President*; Mr. Thirlwall, *Secretary*; Mr. H. J. Rose, *Treasurer*. The late Professor Selwyn, in a speech at the opening of the new Union building, October 30, 1866, stated that on the entrance of the proctors the President said, 'Strangers will please to withdraw, and the House will take the message into consideration.'

[2] *Autobiography of John Stuart Mill*, p. 125.

[3] *Letters*, &c., p. 31.

letter is well worth perusal for the insight it affords into the extent of his reading and the originality of his criticisms; but it is the concluding paragraph which is specially interesting to a biographer. We do not know to what influences the change was due, but it is evident that his mind was passing through a period of unrest; his old determinations had been, at least for the moment, uprooted, and he looked forward with uncertain eyes to an unknown future. 'My disinclination to the Church,' he says, 'has grown from a motive into a reason.' The Bar had evidently been suggested to him as the only alternative, and on that dismal prospect he dilates with unwonted bitterness. It would take him away from all the pursuits he loved most dearly, and put in their place 'the routine of a barren and uninteresting occupation,' in which not only would the best years of his life be wasted, but—and this is what he seems to have dreaded most—his loftier aspirations would be degraded, and when he had become rich enough to return to literature he would feel no inclination to do so.

The Fellowship examination in 1818 having ended in Thirlwall's election, he was free to go abroad, and at once started alone for Rome. At that time Niebuhr was Prussian Envoy there, and Bunsen his Secretary of Legation. Thirlwall was so fortunate as to bring with him a letter of introduction to Madame Bunsen, who had been a Miss Waddington, cousin to Professor Monk, and had married Bunsen about a year before Thirlwall's visit. The following amusing letter from Madame Bunsen to her mother gives an interesting picture of Thirlwall in Rome:—

'*March* 16, 1819.—Mr. Hinds and Mr. Thirlwall are here. . . . My mother has, I know, sometimes suspected that a man's abilities are to be judged of in an *inverse ratio* to his Cambridge honours; but I believe that rule is really not without exception, for Mr. Thirlwall is certainly no dunce, although, as I have been informed, he attained high honours at Cambridge at an earlier age than anybody except, I believe, Porson. In the course of their first interview Charles heard enough from him to induce him to believe that Mr. Thirlwall had studied Greek and Hebrew in good earnest, not merely for *prizes*; also that he had read Mr. Niebuhr's Roman History proved him to possess no trifling knowledge of German; and, as he expressed a wish to improve himself in the language, Charles ventured to invite him to come to us on a Tuesday evening whenever he was not otherwise engaged, seeing that many Germans were in the habit of calling on that day. Mr. Thirlwall has never missed any Tuesday evening since, except the *moccoli* night and one other when it rained dogs and cats. He comes at eight o'clock, and

never stirs to go away till everybody else has wished good night, often at almost twelve o'clock. It is impossible for any one to behave more like a man of sense and a gentleman than he has always done —ready and eager to converse with anybody that is at leisure to speak to him, but never looking fidgety when by necessity left to himself; always seeming animated and attentive, whether listening to music, or trying to make out what people say in German, or looking at one of Goethe's songs in the book while it is sung. And so there are a great many reasons for our being *very much* pleased with Mr. Thirlwall; yet I rather suspect him of being very cold and very dry; and although he seeks, and seeks with general success, to understand everything, and in every possible way increase his stock of ideas, I doubt the possibility of his understanding anything that is to be *felt* rather than *explained*, and that cannot be reduced to a system. I was led to this result by some most extraordinary questions that he asked Charles about Faust (which he had borrowed of us, and which he greatly admired nevertheless, attempting a translation of one of my favourite passages, which, however, I had not pointed out to him as such), and also by his great fondness for the poems of Wordsworth, two volumes of which he insisted on lending to Charles. These books he accompanied with a note, in which he laid great stress upon the necessity of reading the author's *prose essays on his own poems*, in order to be enabled to relish the latter. Yet Mr. Thirlwall speaks of Dante in a manner that would seem to prove a thorough taste for his poetry, as well as that he has really and truly studied it; for he said to me that he thought no person who had taken the trouble to understand the whole of the *Divina Commedia* would doubt about preferring the "Paradiso" to the two preceding parts, an opinion in which I thoroughly agree.[1]

'As Mr. Thirlwall can speak French sufficiently well to make himself understood, and as he has *something to say*, Charles found it very practicable to make him and Professor Bekker acquainted, though Professor Bekker has usually the great defect of *never* speaking but when he is prompted by his own inclination, and of never being *inclined to speak* except to persons whom he has long known—that is, to whose faces and manners he has become accustomed and whose understanding or character he respects or likes. . . . In conclusion, I must say about Mr. Thirlwall that I was prepossessed in his favour by his having made up in a marked manner to Charles rather than to myself. I had no difficulty in getting on with him, but I had all the advances to make; and I can never think the worse of a young man, just fresh from college and unused to the society of women, for not being at his ease with them at first.'

It is vexatious that Thirlwall's biographers should have failed to discover—if indeed they tried to discover—any information about his Roman visit, to which he always looked

[1] An old friend of Bishop Thirlwall informs us that he retained his preference for the 'Paradiso' in after years.

back with delight, occasioned as much by the friends he had made there as by 'the memorable scenes and objects' he had visited.[1] So far as we know, the above letter is the only authority extant. We should like to have heard whether Thirlwall had, or had not, any personal intercourse with Niebuhr, whom we have reason to believe he never met; and to what extent Bunsen influenced his future studies. We find it stated in Bunsen's life that he determined Thirlwall's wavering resolutions in favour of the clerical profession.[2] This, we shall see, is clearly a mistake; but, when we consider the strong theological bias of Bunsen's own mind, it does seem probable that he would direct his attention to the modern school of German divinity. We suspect that Thirlwall had been already influenced in this direction by the example, if not by the direct precepts, of Herbert Marsh, then Lady Margaret's Professor of Theology at Cambridge,[3] who had stirred up a great controversy by translating Michaelis' *Introduction to the New Testament*, and by promoting a more free criticism of the Gospels than had hitherto been thought permissible. However this may be, it is certain that the friendship which began in Rome was one of the strongest and most abiding influences which shaped Thirlwall's character, and just half a century afterwards we find him referring to Bunsen as a sort of oracle in much the same language that Dr. Arnold was fond of employing.

We must pass lightly and rapidly over the next seven years of Thirlwall's life. He entered as a law student at Lincoln's Inn in February 1820, and in 1827 returned to Cambridge. In the intervening period he had given the law a fair trial; but the more he saw of it the less he liked it. It is painful to think of the weary hours spent over work of which he could say, four years after he had entered upon it, 'It can never be anything but loathsome to me;'[4] 'my aversion to the law has not increased, as it scarcely could, from the first day of my initiation into its mysteries;' or to read his pathetic utterances to Bunsen, describing his wretchedness, and the delight he took in his brief excursions out of law into literature, consoling himself with the reflection that perhaps he gained in intensity of enjoyment what he lost in duration. With these feelings it would have been useless for him to persevere; but we think it not improbable that

[1] Letter to Bunsen, November 21, 1831, *Letters*, &c., p. 99.

[2] *Memoirs of Baron Bunsen*, i. 339.

[3] Marsh was professor from 1807 to 1839. The first volume of his translation of Michaelis had appeared in 1793.

[4] *Letters*, &c., p. 55

much of his future eminence as a bishop might have been due to his legal training. As a friend has remarked, 'he carried the temper, and perhaps the habit, of Equity into all his subsequent work.' Even in these years, however, law was not allowed to engross his whole time. From the beginning he had laid this down as a fixed principle. He spent his vacations in foreign travel, and every moment he could snatch from law was devoted to a varied course of reading, of which the main outcome was a translation of Schleiermacher's *Critical Essay on the Gospel of S. Luke*,[1] to which his friend Hare had introduced him. To those who take the trouble of reading this almost forgotten piece of criticism it will appear strange that Thirlwall should have spent so much time over such a curious specimen of misplaced ingenuity. The explanation is to be found, we think, in the opportunity it afforded him for studying the whole question of the origin and authorship of the synoptic Gospels, and, as the title page informs us, for dealing with the contributions to the literature of the subject which had appeared since Bishop Marsh's *Dissertation on the Origin and Composition of our three first Canonical Gospels*, published in 1801. In this direct reference to Marsh's work we find a confirmation of our theory that Thirlwall owed to him his position as a critical theologian, though we can hardly imagine a greater difference than that which must have existed in all other matters between the passionate Toryism of the one and the serene Liberalism of the other.

Thirlwall's return to Cambridge took place in 1827, and he at once undertook his full share of college and University work.[2] His friend Hare had set the example in 1822 by accepting a classical lectureship at Trinity College at the urgent request of Mr. Whewell, then lately appointed to one of the tutorships,[3] and Thirlwall had paid visits to him in the Long Vacations of 1824 and 1825. It is probable that at one of these visits the friends had planned their translation of Niebuhr's *History of Rome*, and that the convenience of working at it together determined the precise period of Thirlwall's return to

[1] *A Critical Essay on the Gospel of S. Luke.* By Dr. Frederick Schleiermacher. With an introduction by the Translator, containing an account of the controversy respecting the origin of the first three Gospels since Bishop Marsh's dissertation. 8vo. London: 1825.

[2] Between 1827 and 1832 he held the college offices of Junior Bursar, Junior Dean, and Head Lecturer. In 1828, 1829, 1832, and 1834 he was one of the examiners for the Classical Tripos.

[3] See Dean Stanley's Memoir of Archdeacon Hare, prefixed to the third edition of *The Victory of Faith.* 1874.

the University. The first volume was far advanced in 1827, and published early in 1828. The second did not appear until 1832. The publication of what Thirlwall rightly terms 'a wonderful masterpiece of genius' in an English dress formed an epoch in historical and classical literature in this country. Yet, notwithstanding its pre-eminent excellence, the work of the translators was bitterly attacked in various places, but particularly in a note appended to an article in the *Quarterly Review*, a criticism which is now remembered only as having called forth a reply known in the University as 'Hare's bark and Thirlwall's bite.'[1] The pamphlet consists of sixty-three pages, of which sixty belong to the former, and a 'Postscript,' of little more than two, to the latter. It is probable that Hare's elaborate vindication of his author, his brother translator, and himself, had but little effect on any one; Thirlwall's indignant sarcasms—worthy of the best days of that controversial style in which he subsequently became a master—must have made the writer feel ashamed of himself. He had expressed pity that the translators should have wasted 'such talents on the drudgery of translation.' Thirlwall took exception to the phrase, and pointed out that their intellectual labour did not deserve to be so spoken of.

'On the other hand, intellectual labour prompted and directed by no higher consideration than that of personal emolument appears to me to deserve an ignominious name; nor do I think such an employment the less illiberal, however great may be the abilities exerted, or the advantages purchased. But I conceive such labour to become still more degrading, when it is let out to serve the views and advocate the opinions of others. It sinks another step lower in my estimation, when, instead of being applied to communicate what is excellent and useful, it ministers to the purpose of excluding from circulation all such intellectual productions as have not been stamped with the seal of the party to which it is itself subservient. But when I see it made the instrument of a religious, political, or literary proscription, forging or pointing calumny and slander, to gratify the malice of hotter and weaker heads against all whom they hate and fear, I have now before me an instance of what I consider as the lowest and basest intellectual drudgery. I leave the application of these distinctions to the QUARTERLY REVIEWER.'

In 1831 the two friends started the publication of the

[1] *A Vindication of Niebuhr's 'History of Rome' from the Charges of the 'Quarterly Review.'* By Julius Charles Hare, M.A. Cambridge, 1829. The passage commented on will be found in the *Quarterly Review* for January 1829 (vol. xxxix. p. 8). The first edition of Niebuhr's own work had been highly praised in an article in the same *Review* for June 1825 (vol. xxxii. p. 67).

Philological Museum. It had a brief but glorious career. Only six numbers were published, but they contained 'more solid additions to English literature and scholarship' than had up to that time appeared in any other journal. We are glad to see that Dean Perowne has republished seven of Thirlwall's contributions, among which is the well-known essay *On the Irony of Sophocles.* In 1832, when Mr. Hare left Cambridge, his friend succeeded him as assistant-tutor, to give classical lectures to the undergraduates on Whewell's 'side.' For a time all went well. His lectures were exceedingly popular with those capable of appreciating them, as was shown by the large attendance not only of undergraduates, but of the best scholars in the college, men who had already taken their degrees, and who were working for the Fellowship Examination or for private improvement. They were remarkable for translations of singular excellence, and for an exhaustive treatment of the subject, as systematic as Hare's had been desultory, as we learn from traditions of them which still survive, and from two volumes of notes which now lie before us, taken down at a course on the Ethics of Aristotle. Moreover Thirlwall was personally popular. He was the least 'donnish' of the resident Fellows, and sought the society of undergraduates, inviting the men who attended his lectures to walk with him or to take wine at his rooms after Hall. He delighted in a good story, and used to throw himself back in his chair, his whole frame shaking with suppressed merriment, when anything especially humorous struck his fancy. He had one habit which, had it been practised with less delicacy, might have marred his popularity. He was fond of securing an eager but inconsiderate talker, whom he drew out, by a series of subtle questions, for the amusement of the rest. So well known was this peculiarity among his older friends that after one of his parties a person who had not been present has been heard to inquire from another who had just left his rooms, 'Who was fool to-day?'

In 1834 Thirlwall's connection with the educational staff of the college was rudely severed by the celebrated controversy respecting the admission of Dissenters to degrees. This debate has been long since forgotten in the University; but the influence which it exercised on Thirlwall's future career, as well as its own intrinsic interest, point it out for particular notice. We had occasion in a recent article[1] to sketch the

[1] 'Half a Century of Cambridge Life,' *Church Quarterly Review*, April 1882.

changes which took place in the University between 1815 and 1830. It will be remembered that the stormy period of our political history which is associated with the first Reform Bill fell between those dates. It was hardly to be expected that Cambridge should escape an influence by which the country was so profoundly affected. Indeed, it may be cited as a sign of the absorbing interest of that question, that it did affect the University so seriously; for there is ample evidence that in the previous century external events, no matter how important, had made but little impression. In 1746 we find the poet Gray lamenting that his fellow academicians were so indifferent to the march of the Pretender; and even the French Revolution excited but a languid enthusiasm, though Dr. Milner, the Vice-Chancellor, and his brother Heads, did their best to draw attention to it by expelling from the University Mr. Frend, of Jesus College, for writing a pamphlet called *Peace and Union*, which advocated the principles of its leaders. With the Reform Bill of 1830, however, the case was very different. Sides were eagerly taken; discussions grew hot and angry; old friends became estranged; and, years afterwards, when children of the next generation asked questions of their parents about some one whose name was mentioned in their hearing, but with whom they were not personally acquainted, the common answer they received was: 'That is Mr. So-and-so; he used to be very intimate with us before the Reform Bill; but we never speak now.'

Among other matters then debated was the exclusion of Dissenters from participation in the advantages of the Universities. The propriety of imposing tests at matriculation, and on proceeding to degrees, especially to degrees in the faculties of law and physic, had been from time to time debated, both in the University and in the House of Commons. The ancient practice had, notwithstanding, been steadily maintained. On one occasion, in 1773, the House had even gone so far as to decline, by a majority of 146, to receive a petition on the subject. In December 1833, however, Professor Pryme offered Graces to the Senate for appointing a Syndicate to consider the abolition or the modification of subscription on graduation. The 'Caput' rejected them. In February of the following year, Dr. Cornwallis Hewett, Downing Professor of Medicine, offered similar Graces to consider the subject with special reference to the faculty of medicine. This also was rejected by the 'Caput.' These two rejections, following so closely upon each other,

made it evident that the authorities of the University were not disposed so much as to consider the subject. It was therefore determined to extend the field of the controversy, and at once to apply to the Legislature. A meeting was held at Professor Hewett's rooms in Downing College, at which it was agreed to present an identical petition to both Houses of Parliament. The document began by stating the attachment of the petitioners to the Church of England, and to the University as connected therewith; and further, their belief 'that no civil or ecclesiastical polity was ever so devised by the wisdom of man as not to require, from time to time, some modification from the change of external circumstances or the progress of opinion.' They then suggested—this was the word employed—

'"That no corporate body, like the University of Cambridge, can exist in a free country in honour and safety unless its benefits be communicated to all classes as widely as may be compatible with the Christian principles of its foundation;" and urged "the expediency of abrogating by legislative enactment every religious test exacted from members of the University before they proceed to degrees, whether of Bachelor, Master, or Doctor, in Arts, Law, or Physic."'

This petition was signed by sixty-two resident members of the Senate. Among them were two Masters of Colleges, Dr. Davy, of Caius, and Dr. Lamb, of Corpus Christi; and nine Professors, Hewett, Lee, Cumming, Clark, Babbage, Sedgwick, Airy, Musgrave, Henslow; some of whom were either Conservatives, or very moderate Liberals. It was presented to the House of Lords by Earl Grey, and to the House of Commons by Mr. Spring-Rice, member for the town of Cambridge. As might have been expected, it was met, after an interval of about ten days, by a protest, signed by 110 residents; which was shortly followed by a counter-petition to Parliament, signed by 258 members of the Senate, mostly non-residents—a number which would no doubt have been greatly enlarged had there been more time for collecting signatures.[1] These expressions of opinion, however, which showed that even resident members of the University were not unanimous in desiring the proposed relief, while non-residents were probably strongly opposed to it, did not prevent the introduction of a Bill into the House of Commons to make it 'lawful for all his Majesty's subjects to enter and matriculate in the Universities of

[1] The first petition was presented to the House of Lords on March 21, 1834; the protest is dated April 3; and the counter-petition was presented on April 21 in the same year.

England, and to receive and enjoy all degrees in learning conferred therein (degrees in Divinity alone excepted), without being required to subscribe any articles of religion, or to make any declaration of religious opinions respecting particular modes of faith and worship.' The third reading of this Bill was carried by a majority of 89; but it was rejected in the House of Lords by a majority of 102.

It will easily be imagined that these proceedings were watched with the greatest interest at Cambridge. Public opinion had risen to fever-heat, and a plentiful crop of pamphlets was the result. It is difficult nowadays to read without a smile these somewhat hysterical productions, and to note the non-fulfilment of their prophecies of untold evils to come, should the fatal measure suggested by the petitioners ever pass into the Statute-book. Among these, that which most concerns our present purpose is one by Dr. Thomas Turton, then Regius Professor of Divinity, and afterwards Lord Bishop of Ely, entitled, *Thoughts on the Admission of Persons, without regard to their Religious Opinions, to certain Degrees in the Universities of England.* Dr. Turton was universally respected, and his pamphlet attracted great attention on that account, and also from the ability and ingenuity of the argument. He adopted the comparative method; and endeavoured to prove the evils that would ensue from the intercourse of young men who differed widely from one another in theological beliefs, by tracing the history of the Theological Seminary for Nonconformists, commenced by the celebrated Dr. Doddridge, in 1729, at Northampton, and subsequently removed to Daventry in 1751. The gauntlet thus thrown down was taken up by Mr. Thirlwall, who lost but little time in addressing to him a *Letter on the Admission of Dissenters to Academical Degrees.* After stating briefly that what he was about to say would be said on his own responsibility, and that he did not come forward as 'the organ or advocate' of those who had taken the same side as himself, many of whom, he thought, would not agree with him, he proceeded to attack the analogy between Cambridge and Daventry which Dr. Turton had attempted to establish. 'Our colleges,' he boldly asserted, 'are not theological seminaries. We have no theological colleges, no theological tutors, no theological students.' The statement was literally true; it might even be said to be as capable of demonstration as the first proposition of the first book of Euclid's *Elements of Geometry*; but uttered in that way, in a controversial pamphlet, in support of a most unpopular cause, it must have sounded like

the blast of a hostile trumpet. This, however, was not all. Dr. Turton had claimed for the Universities the same privilege which was enjoyed by Nonconformists, viz. the possession of colleges where 'those principles of religion alone are taught which are in agreement with their own peculiar views.' Mr. Thirlwall, therefore, proceeded to inquire whether the colleges, though not theological seminaries, might be held to be schools for religious instruction. This question again he answered in the negative; and his opponent having placed in the foremost rank among the privileges long exercised by the Universities (1) the relation of tutor to pupil, (2) the chapel services, (3) the college lectures, he proceeded to examine whether these could 'properly be numbered among the aids to religion which this place furnishes.' To him it appeared impossible, under any circumstances, to instil religion into men's minds against their will. 'We cannot even prescribe exercises, or propose rewards for it, without killing the thing we mean to foster.' The value of the three aids above enumerated had been, he thought, greatly exaggerated; and compulsory attendance at chapel—'the constant repetition of a heartless, mechanical service'—he denounced as a positive evil.

'My reason for thinking that our daily services might be omitted altogether, without any material detriment to religion, is simply that, as far as my means of observation extend, with an immense majority of our congregation it is not a religious service at all, and that to the few remaining it is the least impressive and edifying that can well be conceived.'

He had no fault to find with the way in which the service was conducted; the outward decorum was nearly perfect.

'But if this decorum were to be carried to the highest perfection, as it might easily be, if it should ever become a mode and a point of honour with the young men themselves, the thing itself would not rise one step in my estimation. I should still think, that the best which could be said of it would be, that at the end it leaves every one as it found him, and that the utmost religion could hope from it would be to suffer no incurable wounds.

'As to any other purposes, foreign to those of religion, which may be answered by these services, I have here no concern with them. I know that it is sometimes said that the attendance at chapel is essential to discipline; but I have never been able to understand what kind of discipline is meant: whether it is a discipline of the body, or of the mind, or of the heart and affections. As to the first, I am very sensible of the advantage of early rising; but I think this end might be obtained by a much less circuitous process, and I suppose that it will hardly be reckoned among the uses of our evening service,

that it sometimes proves a seasonable interruption to intemperate gaiety; but I confess that the word discipline, applied to this subject, conveys to my mind no notions which I would not wish to banish: it reminds me either of a military parade, or of the age when we were taught to be *good* at church.'

As a remedy for the existing state of things he suggested a weekly service, 'which should remind the young men of that to which they have, most of them, been accustomed at home.' Such a service as this, he thought, 'would afford the best opportunity of affording instruction of a really religious kind, which should apply itself to their situation and prospects, and address itself to their feelings.'

Next he took the college lectures in divinity, and proceeded to show, that, for the most part, they had no claim to be called theological. This part of his pamphlet excited even greater dissatisfaction than the other; and it must be admitted that it was by far the weakest part of his case. His statements were presently examined, and completely refuted, by Mr. Robert Wilson Evans, then a resident Fellow of Trinity, who published a detailed account of the lectures on the New Testament which he had given during the past year in his own college.

Up to this time Mr. Whewell had taken no part in the controversy, because he had felt himself unable 'fully to agree with either of the contending parties.' But his position as tutor of the college whence the denunciation of the existing system had emanated—for the system of Trinity College was practically the system of all the other colleges in the University also—compelled him, though evidently with the greatest reluctance, to break silence. He argued that Thirlwall's opinion, that we cannot prescribe exercises or propose rewards for religion without killing that which we fain would foster, strikes at the root of all connexion between religion and civil institutions, such as an Established Church and the like; that external influences have always been recognized by Christian communities, and must have been used even in the case of those services at home which his opponent approved. Chapel service is nothing more than family prayers. If, therefore, we teach our students that compulsion is destructive of all religion, shall we not make them doubt the validity of the religion which was instilled into their minds at home? The aim of such ordinances and safeguards is to throw a religious character over all the business of life; to bind religious thought upon us by the strongest of all constraints—the constraint of habit. He admitted that all was not perfect

in the chapel services as they existed; and lamented that the task of those who wished to make the undergraduates more devout would henceforward be harder than it had ever been before, through their consciousness of a want of unanimity among their instructors. A stated method is of use in religion as it is in other studies. What would become of men under the voluntary system? It is interesting to remark that in a subsequent pamphlet written a few months later—in September 1834—he spoke in favour of such a change in the Sunday service as Mr. Thirlwall had suggested. Towards the close of his Mastership this change was effected, and a sermon was introduced at the second of the two morning services on Sundays. We are not aware, however, that the movement which resulted in this alteration was regarded with any special favour by the Master.

Thirlwall's pamphlet is dated May 21; Whewell's four days later. On the 26th the Master, Dr. Wordsworth, wrote to Mr. Thirlwall, calling upon him to resign the assistant-tutorship. The words used were:—

'I trust you will find no difficulty in resigning the appointment of assistant-tutor which I confided to you somewhat more than two years ago. Your continuing to retain it would, I am convinced, be very injurious to the good government, the reputation, and the prosperity of the college in general, to the interests of Mr. Whewell in particular, and to the welfare of the young men, and of many others.'

In another passage he went further still.

'With respect to the letter itself, I have read it with some attention, and, I am sorry to say, with extreme pain and regret. It appears to me of a character so out of harmony with the whole constitution and system of the college that I find some difficulty in understanding how a person with such sentiments can reconcile it to himself to continue a member of a society founded and conducted on principles from which he differs so widely.'

The Heads of Houses of that day regarded themselves as seated upon an academic Olympus, from whose serene heights they surveyed the common herd beneath them with a sort of contemptuous pity; and they not only exacted, but were commonly successful in obtaining, the most precise obedience from their subjects. In Trinity College, however, at least since the days of Dr. Bentley, the Master had usually been in the habit of consulting the Seniors before taking any important step; on this occasion, however, it is quite clear that the Seniors were not consulted. The Master probably thought that as he appointed the assistant-tutors he could also

remove them. We believe, however, that even in those days the Master usually consulted the tutors before appointing their subordinates; and common courtesy would have suggested a similar course of action before dismissing a distinguished scholar. It is said that the Master was advised to take the course he did by Mr. Hugh James Rose, who was in the University at the time, and on Whitsunday, May 18, had preached a sermon at Great S. Mary's on the 'Duty of Maintaining the Truth,' from S. Matt. x. 27: 'What ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the house-tops.' Thirlwall's letter, however, was not published before May 21, so that, unless the nature of it had been known beforehand, it is clear that anything which Mr. Rose had said in his sermon could not have referred to it. That Thirlwall believed that there was some connexion between the sermon, or at any rate the preacher, and his dismissal, is evident from the fact that when he showed the Master's letter to one of the junior Fellows, who expressed indignant surprise that such a course could have been taken, he remarked: 'Ah! let this be a warning to you to preach truth, if need be, upon the house-tops, but never under any circumstances to preach error.'[1]

Thirlwall lost no time in obeying the Master's commands, and then issued a circular to the Fellows of the college, enclosing a copy of the Master's letter, in order that they might learn what was 'the power claimed by the Master over the persons engaged in the public instruction of the college, and the manner in which it has been exercised;' and secondly, that he might learn from them how far they agreed with the Master as to the propriety of his continuing a member of the Society. On this point he entreated each of them to favour him with a 'private, explicit, and unreserved declaration' of his opinions. It is needless to say that one and all desired to retain him among them; and the Master's conduct was condemned by a large majority. It must not, however, be supposed that Thirlwall's own conduct was held to be free from fault. He was much blamed for having resigned so hastily, without consulting any one, as it would appear, except Whewell and Perry. Moreover, many of the Fellows, among whom was Mr. Hare, condemned the Master's action, and censured Thirlwall's rashness in publishing such sentiments while holding a responsible office, with almost equal severity. This feeling explains, as we imagine, the very slight resistance

[1] Thirlwall was a regular attendant at Great S. Mary's, and no doubt heard the sermon in question.

made to an act which, under any other circumstances, would have caused an explosion. The Fellows felt that the victim had put himself in the wrong; and that, much as they regretted the necessity of submission, it was the only course to be taken. Thirlwall mentions in a letter to Professor Pryme that when he showed the Master's communication to Whewell, the latter 'expressed great regret,' but 'did not intimate that there could be any doubt as to our connexion being at an end.'

In reviewing the whole controversy at a distance of nearly half a century, with, we must admit, a strong bias in Thirlwall's favour, it is impossible not to admit that he fell into a very grave error. In all questions of college management it is most important that the authorities should appear, at any rate, to be unanimous; and there are some expressions in a private letter which he addressed to Whewell at the close of the controversy which indicate that by that time he had begun to take the same view. It is easy to see how he had been drawn into an opposite course. He had never considered that he had anything to do with the chapel discipline; he had agreed to attend himself, but he did not consider that such attendance implied approval of the system. His own attendance, as we learn from a contemporary, was something more than formal; he was rarely absent, morning or evening; and his behaviour was remarkable for reverence and devotion. With him, religion had nothing to do with discipline; and it was infinitely shocking to his pure and thoughtful mind to defile things heavenly with things earthly. The far too rigorous rules of attendance which were then in force had exasperated the undergraduates, and their behaviour, without being absolutely profane, was careless and irreverent. Talking was very prevalent, especially on surplice nights, when the music is choral. Thirlwall probably knew, from the friendly intercourse which he maintained with them, what their feelings were, and determined to do his best to get a system altered which produced such disastrous results. It must be remembered that at that time the Act of Uniformity prevented any shortening of the service. Whewell's mind was a very different one. Without being a bigot, he had a profound respect for the existing order of things; shut his eyes to any defects it might have, even when they were pointed out to him; and regarded attempts to subvert it, or even to weaken it, as acts of profanity.

It will be readily conceived that these events rendered Cambridge no pleasant place of residence for Thirlwall, deprived of his occupation as a teacher and unsupported by

any particularly strong force of liberal opinion in the University. Yet he had the courage to make the experiment of continuing to live in college. He went abroad for the Long Vacation of 1834, and returned at the beginning of the October term. In a few weeks, however, the course of his life was changed by an unexpected event. Lord Melbourne's first Ministry broke up, and just as Lord Chancellor Brougham was regretting that Sedgwick and Thirlwall were the only clergymen who had deserved well of the Liberal party for whom he had been unable to provide, came the news of the death of one of the canons of Norwich and of the suicide of the Rector of Kirby Underdale, a valuable but very secluded living in Yorkshire. He at once offered the canonry to Sedgwick and the rectory to Thirlwall. Both offers were accepted, we believe, without hesitation; and both appointments, though evidently made without regard to the special fitness of the persons selected, were thoroughly successful. Sedgwick threw himself into the duties of a cathedral dignitary with characteristic vigour; and Thirlwall, whose only experience of parochial work had been at Over, in Cambridgeshire, a small village without a parsonage, of which he was vicar for a few months in 1829, became a zealous and popular parish priest. His biographer records that 'the recollection still survives of regular services with full and attentive congregations, including incomers from neighbouring villages; of the frequent visits to the village school; of the extempore prayers with his flock, of which the larger number were Dissenters; of the assiduous attentions to the sick and poor.' And his old friend, Archdeacon Hare, writing to Dr. Whewell in 1840, describes his work in his parish as 'perfect,' and holds up his example as 'an encouragement' to his correspondent to go and do likewise.[1]

Thirlwall did not revisit Cambridge until 1842, when he stayed in Trinity College for two days during the installation of the Duke of Northumberland as Chancellor. Such an occasion, however, does not give much opportunity for judging of the real state of the University. He paid a similar visit in 1847, when Prince Albert was installed. After this he did not see Cambridge again until the spring of 1869, when he stayed at Trinity Lodge with the present Master, Dr. Thompson, and on Whitsunday, May 16, preached before the University in Great S. Mary's Church. He has himself recorded that he was never so much pleased with the place

[1] *Life of Dr. Whewell*, by Mrs. Stair Douglas, p. 211.

since he went up as a freshman, and has given an amusing description of a leisurely stroll round the backs of the colleges and through part of the town,[1] which, he might have added, he insisted upon taking without a companion. Those who conversed with him on that occasion remember that he was much struck by the changes which had taken place in the University since he had left it; and that he observed with pleasure the increased numbers of the undergraduates, and the movement and activity which seemed to reign everywhere.

It was at Kirby Underdale that Thirlwall wrote the greater part of the work on which his reputation as a scholar and a man of letters will chiefly rest—his *History of Greece*—of which the first volume had been published before he left Cambridge.[2] It is, perhaps, fortunate for the world that he had bound himself to produce the volumes at regular intervals,[3] and that his editor, Dr. Dionysius Lardner (whom he used to call 'Dionysius the Tyrant'), was not a man to grant delays; for, had the conditions been easier, parochial cares and new interests might have retarded the production of it indefinitely, or even stopped it altogether. From the first Thirlwall had applied himself to the work with strenuous and unremitting energy. At Cambridge he used to work all day until half-past three o'clock in the afternoon, when he might be seen leaving his rooms for a half-hour's rapid walk before dinner, which then was served in Hall at four o'clock; and in the country he is said to have spent sixteen hours of the twenty-four in his study. We do not know what the original design of the work, as part of the *Cabinet Cyclopædia*, was, but we have it on Thirlwall's own authority that it was 'much narrower than that which it actually reached,'[4] and before long it was further expanded into eight goodly octavos. The first of these was scarcely in the hands of the public when Grote's *History of Greece*, published, like its predecessor, volume by volume, began to make its appearance. It was mentioned above that Grote and Thirlwall had been schoolfellows; but, though they met not unfrequently in London afterwards, Thirlwall knew so little of his friend's intentions that he had been heard to say, 'Grote is the man who ought

[1] *Letters to a Friend*, p. 191.

[2] The preface to the first edition of vol. i. is dated 'Trinity College, June 12, 1835.' The dates of the subsequent volumes are ii. iii., 1836; iv., 1837; v., 1838; vi., 1839; vii., 1840; viii., 1844.

[3] *Letters*, &c. p. 138.

[4] Preface to the second edition, dated 'London, May 1845.'

to write the History of Greece.' When it did appear he at once welcomed it with enthusiasm. 'High as my expectations were of it,' he writes to Dr. Schmitz, 'it has very much surpassed them all, and affords an earnest of something which has never been done for the subject either in our own or any other literature;'[1] and to Grote himself, when the publication of four volumes had enabled him to form a maturer judgment, he not only used stronger words of praise, but contrasted it with his own History in terms which for generosity and sincerity can never be surpassed. After alluding to 'the great inferiority' of his 'own performance' he concludes as follows: 'I may well be satisfied with that measure of temporary success and usefulness which has attended it, and can unfeignedly rejoice that it will, for all highest purposes, be so superseded.'[2] It would be beside our present purpose to attempt a comparison of the relative merits of these two works, which, by a curious coincidence, had been elaborated simultaneously. They have many points of resemblance. Both originated in a desire to apply to the history of Greece those principles of criticism which Niebuhr had applied so successfully to the history of Rome; both were intended to counteract the misrepresentations of Mitford; both were the result of long and careful preparation. Grote has a decided advantage in point of style; he writes vigorous, 'newspaper' English, as might be expected from a successful pamphleteer; while Thirlwall's periods are laboured and somewhat wooden. But, notwithstanding Thirlwall's own feeling of Grote's superiority, and the precedence which his History has unquestionably taken up to the present time, we think it not improbable that posterity may reverse the verdict. Grote is always a partisan. We do not mean that he wilfully misrepresents facts; he certainly does not; but he unconsciously finds 'extenuating circumstances' for those with whom he sympathizes, and condemns remorselessly those whose springs of action are alien to his own. We need only remind our readers of his treatment of Kleon and Nikias. Again, his busy life left him no leisure for acquiring exact scholarship; and many of his conclusions have been overthrown by critics who, inferior to him in power, possessed the indispensable knowledge of minute points of language in which he was deficient.[3] Thirlwall, on the contrary, holds the judicial balance with a firm hand. In estimating character

[1] *Letters*, &c. p. 194. The letter is dated April 9, 1846.
[2] *The Personal Life of George Grote.* By Mrs. Grote, p. 173.
[3] *Thucydides or Grote?* By Richard Shilleto, M.A. 1851.

his serene intellect is never warped by partisanship, or by a wish to present old facts under a new face; while from his scholarship and critical power there is no appeal. The public will probably continue to read Grote; but we venture to prophesy that students will return to Thirlwall, even if they have not already done so.

After a residence of five years at Kirby Underdale Thirlwall was unexpectedly made Bishop of S. David's by Lord Melbourne. Lord Houghton, an intimate friend of both the Bishop and the Minister, has recorded that Lord Melbourne was in the habit not merely of reading, but of severely judging and criticising the writings of every divine whom he thought of promoting. By some accident the translation of Schleiermacher's essay had fallen in his way soon after it appeared; he had formed a high opinion of Thirlwall's share in the work, and so far back as 1837 had done his best to send the author to Norwich instead of Dr. Stanley. On this occasion the bishops whom the Minister consulted regarded the orthodoxy of the views sustained in the essay as questionable, and Thirlwall's promotion was deferred. In 1840, however, Lord Melbourne got his way, and the bishopric of S. David's was offered in due form to the Rector of Kirby Underdale. His first impulse was to refuse; but his friends persuaded him to go to London, and at least have an interview with Lord Melbourne. We do not vouch for the literal accuracy of the following scene, but it is too amusing not to be related. The time is the forenoon; the place, Lord Melbourne's bedroom. He is supposed to be in bed, surrounded by letters and newspapers. On Thirlwall's entrance he delivers the following allocution:—

'Very glad to see you; sit down, sit down. Hope you are come to say you accept? I only wish you to understand that I don't intend, if I know it, to make a heterodox bishop. I don't like heterodox bishops. As men they may be very good anywhere else, but I think they have no business on the bench. I take great interest,' he continued, 'in theological questions, and I have read a good deal of those old fellows,' pointing to a pile of folio editions of the Fathers. 'They are excellent reading, and very amusing. Some time or other we must have a talk about them. I sent your edition of Schleiermacher to Lambeth, and asked the Primate (Howley) to tell me candidly what he thought of it; and look, here are his notes in the margin. Pretty copious, you see. He does not concur in all your opinions, but he says there is nothing heterodox in your book. Had he objected I would not have appointed you.'[1]

[1] *Memoirs of Viscount Melbourne.* By W. M. Torrens, M.P. Vol. ii. p. 332. Lord Houghton in the *Fortnightly Review*, February 1878.

We should like to know how Thirlwall answered this strange defender of the faith; but tradition is silent on the point. Before leaving, however, the offer was accepted; and, with as little delay as possible, the Bishop removed to his diocese and entered upon his duties.

Thirlwall's life as a bishop did not differ much, at least in its outward surroundings, from his life as a parish clergyman. The palace at S. David's having been allowed to fall to ruin, the Bishop is compelled to live at Abergwili, a small village near Carmarthen, distant nearly fifty miles from his cathedral. Most persons would have regretted the isolation of such a position, but to Thirlwall the enforced solitude of Abergwili was thoroughly congenial. There he could read, as he delighted to do, 'literally from morning till night.' Except in summer time he rarely quitted 'Chaos,' as he called his library, where books lined the walls and shared with papers and letters the tables, chairs, and floor. It is curious that a man with so orderly a mind should have had such disorderly habits. His letters are full of references to lost papers; and when offers to arrange his drawers were made he would answer regretfully, 'I can find nothing in them now, but if they were set to rights for me I should certainly find nothing then.' Books accompanied him to his meals; and when he went out for a walk or a drive he read steadily most of the time. He does not seem to have had any favourite authors; he read eagerly new books in all languages and on all subjects. We believe that he took no notes of what he read; but his singularly powerful memory enabled him to seize all that he wanted, and, as may be seen from the collection of his writings which is now before us, to retain it until required for use. His charges, essays, and serious correspondence reveal his mastery of theological literature, both past and present; the strong mental grasp with which he applied the lessons of the past to the edification of the present; the wise tolerance for views which were not his own—a tolerance which yet had limits which sometimes, as we shall see, excited no little surprise—and, we may add, the terrible strength of his satire. The charming *Letters to a Friend* give us very pleasant glimpses of the gentler side of his character. We find from them that he took a keen interest in the general literature of England and the Continent, whether in philosophy, history, biography, fiction, poetry; and as he and his young correspondent exchanged their sentiments without restraint, we can enjoy to the full his criticisms, now serious, now playful, on authors and their productions,

his generous appreciation of all that is noble in life or art. We must find room for one passage on George Eliot's last story, written in 1872, when he was seventy-five years old.

'I suppose you cannot have read *Middlemarch*, as you say nothing about it. It stands quite alone. As one only just moistens one's lips with an exquisite liqueur to keep the taste as long as possible in one's mouth, I never read more than a single chapter of *Middlemarch* in the evening, dreading to come to the last, when I must wait two months for a renewal of the pleasure. The depth of humour has certainly never been surpassed in English literature. If there is ever a shade too much learning that is Lewis's fault.'[1]

But there was another reason for his enjoyment of Abergwili. Student as he was, he delighted in the sights, the sounds, the air of the country. He never left it for his annual migration to London without regret, partly because it was so troublesome to move the mass of books without which he could not bear to leave home, but still more because the bustle and dust of London annoyed him; and in the midst of congenial society, and the enjoyment of music and pictures, his thoughts reverted with longing regret to his trees, his flowers, and his domestic pets. Even his books did not interest him as they did. He had begun his social relations with dogs and cats in Yorkshire, and an amusing story is told of the way in which the former disconcerted certain preparations for a formal reception of him when he came home after accepting the bishopric of S. David's, by jumping on his shoulders and excluding all human attentions.[2] At Abergwili he extended his affections to birds, and kept peacocks, pheasants, canaries, swans, and tame geese, which he regularly fed every morning, no matter what the weather might be. They treated him with easy familiarity, for they used to seize his coat-tails with their beaks to show their welcome. His flowers had to yield to the tastes of his four-footed friends. One day his gardener complained, 'What am I to do, my Lord? The hares have eaten your carnations.' 'Plant more carnations,' was his only reply. Fine summer weather would draw him out of 'Chaos' into the field or garden; and one of his letters gives a delicious picture of his enjoyment of a certain June, sitting on the grass while the haymakers were at work in the field beyond, reading *The Earthly Paradise*, and watching the movements of 'a dear horse' who paced up and down with a rake to turn and toss the hay.[3]

It must not, however, be supposed that Bishop Thirlwall

[1] *Letters to a Friend*, p. 278. [2] *Ibid.* p. 161. [3] *Ibid.* p. 292.

lived the life of an indolent man of letters. No bishop ever performed the duties of his position more thoroughly, or with greater sacrifice of personal care and comfort. His first care was to learn Welsh, and in a little more than a year he could read prayers and preach in that language. In his large and little-known diocese locomotion was not easy and accommodation often hard to obtain. Yet he visited every part of it, personally inspected the condition of the schools and churches (deplorable enough in 1840), and regularly performed the duties of confirmation, preaching, and visitation. In the charge of 1866 he reviewed the improvements which had been accomplished up to that time, and could mention 183 churches to the restoration of which the Church Building Society had made grants, and more than thirty parishes in which either new or restored churches were in progress. Besides these others had been restored by private munificence; others, including the cathedral, by public subscription; many parsonages had been built, livings had been augmented, and education had been largely increased.[1] To all these excellent objects he had himself been a munificent contributor, and we believe that from the beginning to the end of his episcopate he spent nearly 40,000*l.* in charities of various kinds.[2] Yet with all these claims on the gratitude of the clergy we are sorry to say that he was not personally popular. It would have been more wonderful perhaps had he been so. The Welsh clergy forty years ago were a rough and uncultivated body of men, narrow-minded and prejudiced, and with habits hardly more civilized than those of the labourers around them. They were ill at ease with an English man of letters. He was to them an object of curiosity, possibly of dread. The new Bishop intimated his wish that the clergy should come to his house without restraint, and when there should be treated as gentlemen and equals. This was of itself an innovation. In his predecessor's time when a clergyman called at Abergwili he entered by the back door, and if he stayed to dinner he took that meal in the housekeeper's room with the upper servants. Thirlwall abolished these customs and entertained the clergy at his own table. This was excellent in intention, but impossible in practice. The difference in tastes, feelings, manners, between

[1] *Charges*, vol. ii. pp. 90–100.

[2] In his charge for 1851 (*Charges*, vol. i. p. 150) he announced his intention to devote the surplus of his income to the augmentation of small livings, and in 1866 he pointed out that the fund had up to that time yielded 24,000*l.* (*ibid.* vol. ii. p. 98).

the entertainer and the entertained made social intercourse equally disagreeable to both parties; and the Bishop felt obliged to substitute correspondence for visits, as far as he was able so to do, reserving personal intercourse for the archdeacons, or those clergymen whose education enabled them to appreciate his friendship.[1] Again, the peculiar tone of his mind must be remembered. He was nothing if not critical; and, further, as one of his oldest friends once said in our hearing, 'he was the most thoroughly veracious man I ever knew.' He could not listen to a hasty, ill-considered remark without taking it to pieces, and demonstrating, by successive questions, put in a slow, deliberate tone of voice, the fallacy of the separate parts of the proposition, and, by consequence, of the whole. Hence he was feared and respected rather than beloved; and those who ought to have been proud of having such a man among them wreaked their small spite against him by accusing him of being inhospitable, of walking out attended by a dog trained to know and bite a curate, and the like. These slanders, of which we hope he was unconscious, he could not answer; those who attacked him in public he could and did crush with an accuracy of exposition, and a power of sarcasm, for which it would be hard to find a parallel. We need only refer to his answers to Sir Benjamin Hall, M.P. for Marylebone, on the general question of the condition of the churches in his diocese, appended to his charge for 1851, and on the special case of the Collegiate Church of Brecon, in two letters to the Archbishop of Canterbury; or to the *Letter to the Rev. Rowland Williams*, published in 1860. Mr. Williams had published some sermons, entitled *Rational Godliness*, the supposed heterodoxy of which had alarmed the clergy of his diocese, seventy of whom had signed a memorial to the Bishop, praying him to take some notice of the book: in other words, to remove the author from the college at Lampeter, of which he was vice-principal. The Bishop had declined to interfere, and in his charge of

[1] He particularly disliked gossip. At Kirby Underdale the old sexton used to relate how Mr. Thirlwall said, 'I never 'ears no tales;' and the following story shows that he maintained the same wise discretion after he became a bishop. One of his archdeacons thought it right to tell him that a certain clergyman in the diocese, who was a clever mimic, was fond of entertaining his friends with imitations of the Bishop. Thirlwall listened, and then inquired, 'Does he do me well?' 'I am sure I cannot say, my Lord,' replied the informer; 'I was never present myself at one of these disgraceful exhibitions.' 'Ah! I should like to know, because he does *you* admirably,' replied the Bishop. It is needless to say that no more stories were carried to his ears.

1857 had discussed the question at length, considering it, as was his manner, from all points of view, and, while he found much to blame, defending the author's intentions, on the ground of his own high opinion of his personal character. This, however, did not satisfy Mr. Williams. We cannot help suspecting that he was longing for a martyr's crown; and, indignant at not having obtained one, he addressed the Bishop at great length in what he called *An Earnestly Respectful Letter on the Difficulty of bringing Theological Questions to an Issue.* He described the charge as 'a miracle of cleverness,' but deplored its indefiniteness; he drew a picture of 'a preacher in our wild mountains' who came to seek counsel from his bishop and got only evasive answers—'in all helps for our guidance Abergwili may equal Delphi in wisdom, but also in ambiguity'[1]—and entreated the Bishop to declare plainly his own opinion on the questions raised. For once Bishop Thirlwall's serenity was fairly ruffled. Stung by the ingratitude of a man whom he had steadily befriended, and whose aim was, as he thought, to draw him into admissions damaging to himself, he struck with all his might and main, and, as was said at the time, 'you may hear every bone in his adversary's body cracking.' One specimen of the remarkable power of his reply must suffice. On the comparison of himself to the Delphic oracle he remarked:—

'Even if I had laid claim to oracular wisdom I should have thought this complaint rather unreasonable; for the oracle at Delphi, though it pretended to divine infallibility, was used to wait for a question before it gave a response. But I wish above all things to be sure as to the person with whom I have to do. I remember to have read of one who went to the oracle at Delphi, "ex industriâ factus ad imitationem stultitiæ;' and I cannot help suspecting that I have before me one who has put on a similar disguise. The voice does not sound to me like that of a "mountain clergyman;" while I look at the roll I seem to recognize a very different and well-known hand. The "difficulties" are very unlike the expression of an embarrassment which has been really felt, but might have been invented in the hope of creating one. They are quite worthy of the mastery which you have attained in the art of putting questions, so as most effectually to prevent the possibility of an answer.'[2]

But if Thirlwall's great merits were not fully appreciated in his own diocese there was no lack of recognition of them in the

[1] *An Earnestly Respectful Letter*, 8vo. 1860, pp. 20–23. See also *The Life and Letters of Rowland Williams, D.D.*, London, 1874, chap. xv., where his determination to make the Bishop declare himself, under the belief that he really agreed with him, is expressly stated.

[2] *A Letter to the Rev. Rowland Williams*, 8vo. 1860, p. 19.

Church at large. Dean Perowne remarks most truly that he 'did not belong to the modern type of bishop, whose efficiency is measured in common estimation by his power of speech and motion.'[1] His seclusion at Abergwili largely increased his influence. It was known that he thought out questions for himself, without consulting his episcopal brethren or his friends, and without being influenced in any way, as even the most conscientious men must be, in despite of themselves, by the opinions which they hear expressed in society. Hence his utterances came to be accepted as the decisions of a judge; of one who, standing on an eminence, could take 'an oversight of the whole field of ecclesiastical events,'[2] and from that commanding position could distinguish what was of permanent importance from that which possessed a merely controversial interest as a vexed question of the day. We have spoken of the advantages which he derived from his secluded life; it must be admitted that it had also certain disadvantages. The freshness and originality of his opinions, the judicial tone of his independent decisions, gave them a permanent value; but his want of knowledge of the opinions of those from whom he could not wholly dissociate himself, and, we may add, his indifference to them, caused him to be not unfrequently misunderstood, and to be charged with holding views not far removed from heresy. 'I will not call him an unbeliever, but a misbeliever,' said a very orthodox bishop, whose love of epigram occasionally got the better of his charity. His brother bishops, like the Welsh clergy, feared him more than they loved him; they knew his value as an ally, but they knew also that he would never, under any circumstances, become a partizan or adopt a view which he could not wholly approve, merely because it seemed good to his Order to exhibit unanimity. It was probably for this reason, as much as for his eloquence and power, that he had the ear of the House of Lords on the rare occasions when he addressed it. The Peers knew that they were listening to a man who had the fullest sense of the responsibilities of the episcopate, but who would neither defend nor oppose a measure because 'the proprieties' indicated the side on which a bishop would be expected to vote. Two only of his speeches are republished in the collection before us—on the Civil Disabilities of the Jews (1848), and on the Disestablishment of the Irish Church (1869). We should like to have added to these that on the grant to the Roman Catholic College

[1] Preface to *Letters*, &c. p. vi.

[2] Dean Stanley's preface to the *Letters to a Friend*, p. xi.

of Maynooth (1845), which seems to us to be equally worth preserving. On these occasions Bishop Thirlwall took the unpopular side at periods of great excitement; his arguments were listened to with the utmost attention, and in the case of the Irish Church it has been stated that no speech had a greater effect in favour of the measure than his.

In all Church matters he was a thorough Liberal. His view of the Church of England cannot be better stated than by quoting a passage from one of his *Letters*. He had been reading Mr. Robertson's sermons; and after saying that their author was specially recommended to him by the hostility of the *Record*, 'which I consider as a proof of some excellence in every one who is its object,' he thus proceeds:—

'He was certainly not orthodox after the *Record* standard, but might very well be so after another. For our Church has the advantage—such I deem it—of more than one type of orthodoxy: that of the High Church, grounded on one aspect of its formularies; that of the Low Church, grounded on another aspect; and that of the Broad Church, striving to take in both, but in its own way. Each has a right to a standing-place, none to exclusive possession of the field. Of course this is very unsatisfactory to the bigots of each party—at the two extremes. Some would be glad to cast the others out; and some yearn after a living source of orthodoxy, of course on the condition that it sanctions their own views. To have escaped this worst of evils ought, I think, to console every rational Churchman for whatever he finds amiss at home.'

Had the Bishop added that he wished each of these parties to have fair play, but that none should be exalted at the expense of the others, we should have had a summary of the principles which regulated his public life. Let it not, however, be supposed that he was an indifferent looker-on. He held that truth had many sides; that it might be viewed in different ways by persons standing in different positions; but still it was to him clear, and definite, and based upon a rock which no human assailant could shake. This, we think, is the keynote which is struck in every one of those eleven most remarkable charges which are now for the first time collected together. We would earnestly commend them to the study of all who are interested in the history of the Church of England during the period which they cover. Every controversy which agitated her, every measure which affected her welfare, is discussed by a master hand; the real question at issue is carefully pointed out; the trivial is distinguished from the important; moderation and charity are insisted upon; angry passions are allayed; and while the liberty of

the individual is perpetually asserted the duty of maintaining her doctrines is strenuously inculcated. As illustrations of some of these characteristics we would contrast his exhaustive analysis of the Tractarian movement or the Gorham controversy with his conduct respecting *Essays and Reviews*. In the one case he hesitated to condemn; he preferred to allay the terror with which his clergy were evidently inspired. In the other, though always 'decidedly opposed to any attempt to narrow the freedom which the law allows to every clergyman of the Church of England in the expression of his opinion on theological subjects,' he joined his brother bishops in signing the famous 'Encyclical,' which we now know was the composition of Bishop Wilberforce, because he thought that in this case the principles advocated led to a negation of Christianity.

There were many other duties besides the care of the diocese of S. David's to which the Bishop devoted himself, but these we must dismiss with a passing notice. We allude to his work in Convocation, as a member of the Ritual Commission, and as chairman of the Old Testament Revision Company. Gradually, however, as years advanced, his physical powers began to fail, and he resolved to resign his bishopric. This resolution was carried into effect in 1874. He retired to Bath, where he was still able to continue many of his old pursuits, and by the help of his nephew and his family, and notwithstanding blindness and deafness, to maintain his old interests. He died rather suddenly at last, July 27, 1875, and was buried in Westminster Abbey, where, by a singularly felicitous arrangement, his remains were laid in the same grave as those of George Grote.

Regret has been often expressed that Bishop Thirlwall did not write more. We do not share this feeling. Had he written more he would have thought less, studied less, possessed in a less perfect degree that '*cor sapiens et intelligens ad discernendum judicium*'[1] which was never weary of trying to impart to others a portion of its own serenity. At seventy-six years of age, just before his resignation, he could say, 'I should hesitate to say that whatever is is best; but I have strong faith that it is *for* the best, and that the general stream of tendency is toward good;' and in the last sentence of his last charge he bade his clergy remark that even controversies were 'a sign of the love of truth which, if often passionate and one-sided, is always infinitely preferable to the quiet of apathy and indifference.'

[1] These words are inscribed upon Bishop Thirlwall's grave.

ART. VII.—CLERGY PENSIONS.

1. *Church Finance.* By the Rev. PREBENDARY WOOD. (London, 1874.)
2. *The Church and her Curates.* (London, 1874.)

IN our Review for April 1882 an article on 'The Position and Prospects of Curates' attracted considerable attention. After examining some of the theoretical disadvantages of the position of unbeneficed clergy of the Church of England, it suggested a method whereby many of these disadvantages might be either removed or modified by the establishment of a Pension Fund for all unbeneficed clergy reaching the age of sixty years; and laid down a scheme whereby such a measure might be easily effected in the case of all *future* entrants upon the ministry, if the bishops could be induced to act upon the terms of the proposal, and ordain (if necessary, seeking legal power for the purpose) candidates to deacon's orders at twenty-two years of age instead of at twenty-three; the condition of such earlier ordination being that they should not only be provided, as is now stipulated, with a title and sufficient stipend, but also with a paid-up claim to a pension of 100*l.*, in case of their being unbeneficed at sixty years of age. It was shown that a general payment of 50*l.* from each person so to be ordained would secure him such a pension, and that the candidate, being thus empowered during his twenty-third year to earn a curate's stipend (averaging 125*l.*), while at present he can earn nothing, would, under these circumstances, be not only secure against want in old age, but be better off than at present by 75*l.*

The subject was brought forward by its proposer, the Rev. W. L. Blackley, Rector of North Waltham, at the annual meeting of the Curates' Augmentation Fund, and again at the Derby Church Congress, and has met with very favourable opinions from several members of the episcopate.

There seems no reason why a proposal of so considerable advantage both to Church and Churchmen should not, by-and-by, be introduced into practice. In any case its putting forward has awakened a considerable and widely spreading interest in the question of clergy pensions, which we trust will not be allowed to languish, and which may make welcome an article on pensions obtainable not merely by candidates for

holy orders, but by all the unbeneficed clergy at every period of their ministry.

We propose, in its course—

I. Firstly to examine suggestions often made for securing clergy pensions from church endowments, and show their general impracticability;

II. Next we will indicate the source whence part of the funds requisite for such provision should reasonably be sought for; and

III. We will put forward certain statistics and calculations tending, we trust, to show at what unexpectedly small cost to the contributors, and with what possibly very large advantage to the Church itself, the desired provision may be generally secured.

It will be well, before explaining the sort of organization we should aim at establishing, to make very clear the sort we ought not to strive for, at least at first. And this excludes a good many excellent proposals from our purview. We must have a national institution, not a diocesan one (which, for instance, excludes the excellent proposal made by the Rev. H. B. Rawnsley, Vicar of Wray, near Ambleside); for any merely diocesan society must more or less act in limitation of what among the ordinary wage-earning class is described as 'migration of labour.' And, as we must aim at laying a foundation stone of clerical independence before we can carve a coping stone for the completion of clerical comfort, we must also leave out of view at present all proposals for life insurance (such, for instance, as that most ingenious and interesting one established in the diocese of Bangor, chiefly owing to the sound and thoughtful elaboration of the Rev. Warren Trevor, Vicar of Penman, Beaumaris).

Probably many readers will be rather shocked at this cool exclusion from consideration of those very efforts which they are accustomed to consider the most desirable and the most duty-doing for men whose income depends upon their life; but we must refer them to the title of our article to show that, though clergy pensions and provision for clergymen's families may both be secured by insurances, the things themselves in object and essence are entirely distinct.

The purchase of a pension provides *for a man himself* in his lifetime; the insuring of a man's life can only possibly provide *for other people.* That his children shall receive a hundred pounds a year at a clergyman's death is, no doubt, very desirable for them; but that he himself should have it for his own needs, and perhaps for his own existence, is another

matter, and of much earlier importance, since, if he cannot provide for his own existence, the children depending on him may starve while waiting for his death to give them their provision.

For this plain reason we leave out of our present consideration everything but the securing of retiring pensions, feeling that once the independence of the individual clergyman is assured he will be in a far more advantageous position than otherwise for providing for those whom he may have to leave behind him.

Nor let this be a discouraging consideration; for once the pension fund fully established, understood, and introduced, it will afford an otherwise unattainable firm basis on which to build up other sections of clerical provision, on which at last the coping stone of completion may be fitly placed, and so the work be crowned.

I. With regard to overcoming the admitted difficulty of provision by any large number of our clergy, beneficed or unbeneficed, but more especially the latter, there are some very favourite and very foolish suggestions continually made, the pertinence of which it may be well for us to demolish beforehand.

One of these is the systematical readjustment of Church endowments generally, by reducing the larger livings and enlarging the smaller ones. This course is commonly suggested and advocated by persons who happen to know of one living having a large income and small population, and perhaps of three or four with a small income and large population. But the plan is never pressed by reasonable men when once they have made one single step into the necessary statistics of the subject.

For, apart from the fact that no adjustment of income could, if desirable, ever be final, so long as population fluctuates, not only in parishes urban or rural, but even in counties (of which we have a most striking instance in the Cornwall of 1881 having a population of only nine-tenths of the Cornwall of 1871), the first examination of the figures would show how little any equalization of Church endowments could do towards providing any true adequacy of clerical income to immediate needs, to say nothing of future provision. For to apportion the entire clerical income of England equally between all clerics, making no difference between an archbishop and a newly-ordained deacon, would only give each one a stipend of 242*l.* *gross*, which, when necessary deductions were made, would leave a smaller *net*

income for each man ordained. Suppose we placed that average sum at 220*l.*: what amount of this would our would-be reformers consider each clergyman could spare, after defraying all current expenses, to provide retiring pension for his own old age and life insurance for those dependent upon him?

Another sapient suggestion is that of laying hands upon the firstfruits and tenths of Queen Anne's Bounty, which can only be seriously suggested, as likely to produce an adequate amount for the purpose in view, by people who have no notion whatever of what the firstfruits are; who imagine possibly that they are full first year's incomes on every living, instead of being levies merely of the sum at which the living was estimated years ago 'in the King's books;' and who are unaware that even such firstfruits on such livings only accrue, on an average, once in sixteen years, that being the average length of time that any one living is held by any one incumbent. Now, as every beneficed man has already paid his firstfruits, it is plain that the proposed clergy pensions, if drawn from this source, must be provided only by future and not by present incumbents. The money, therefore, to be realized by such a method would amount to a mere flea-bite as compared with the sum needed for a General Clergy Pension Fund, and is being applied to a far more practical purpose at the present time.

Akin to this expedient is the bolder one of taxing all clerical incomes, to whatever extent the governors of Queen Anne's Bounty may think expedient, by a uniform percentage sufficient to retire every clergyman who chooses on 100*l.* a year at a stated age. Apart from the absolute incalculability of such a tax (from the impossibility of ascertaining with certainty beforehand who might be willing to avail themselves of such a pension), and leaving out of view the weighty consideration that in proportion as such a scheme included those clergy nearest the pension age at the time of its establishment more or less gratuitously, or on equal terms with all younger men, it would really be doing an extreme injustice while establishing the evil principle of a Clerical Poor Law, and tending thus to pauperize and degrade the clerical profession.

And it would have another and very injurious effect upon the Church itself and Church work generally in diminishing the number of curates employed. For, if the appointing and paying of a curate were, in any case except that of an incumbent's physical inability to officiate, a compulsory matter,

and a condition of any man holding a benefice, a compulsory insurance for that curate's contingent necessity, if we can conceive it enacted, might be raised; apart from the policy, the justice, or the proportion of cost, the law might compel the tax, just as, at the present time, it succeeds in the compulsory collection of poor rates. But the employment of curates being uncompellable, as it is, the immediate effect of any such measure would obviously be to diminish the number of curates employed. As this is an important point to make clear, we must enlarge a little upon it.

Because so many incumbents employ curates, a very general idea exists that they are bound to employ them; than which no error is more common, and very few have been productive of greater injury both to the interests of the Church of England itself and to the true Church spirit of her members, clerical and lay alike. Unless in the very rare cases where an endowment exists for the purpose, no incumbent in the Church of England is bound to supply any ministrations except his own. The piety of our ancestors endowed our churches, but in each case provided for the services of one ordained man to do the work of each parish. Where and when that man is proved unfit or unable to discharge his duties his stipend is rightly chargeable with the support of a substitute; but in no other circumstances is he under any sort of obligation to provide the parish with ministrations of other ordained men than himself.

This is a true principle, which needs in the present day to be frankly stated and upheld. For so constantly do our beneficed clergy accept, as a matter of zeal and conscience, what is no matter of law or compulsion, that even bishops will think it no unreasonable thing to say, in offering a living to a clergyman, 'The population is a large one, and will require (or cannot be worked without) one, or two, or three curates;' and the nominee will conscientiously accept such a hint as involving the payment for such curates out of his clerical income, and will undertake it cheerfully, though by so doing he is simply undertaking what is really the duty of other people, and thus pauperizing the Church people who should provide for the Church's immediate needs, and who would do so if the burden, which, divided among all, would be trifling, were not voluntarily borne by the too willing shoulders of one whose life and work and usefulness that burden crushes from the outset.

It is estimated[1] by the Rev. A. Mackreth Deane, a skilled

[1] In *The Church and her Curates*, cited at head of this article.

authority on the subject, that the incumbents of the Church of England pay from their own pockets no less a sum than 400,000*l.* annually out of the 687,000*l.* expended in curates' stipends. Plainly that is paid only by the comparatively small section who employ stipendiary curates at all. What proportion these bear to the whole number of incumbents we cannot accurately say, but the following return of the single diocese of Winchester may give us an approximation. In this diocese there are altogether 551 benefices, in which are employed 262 curates.[1] Of these benefices 47 employ more than one curate, absorbing an aggregate of 114, while the remaining 148 are employed in 148 separate benefices. Out of 551 benefices, therefore, curates are employed in only 195 —that is, in 35 parishes per cent., or, in round numbers, in every third parish.

Now it being perfectly well known that, except in the very rare cases[2] of actually disabling physical infirmity, the employment of curates cannot be compelled, we find that 400,000*l.* is being *voluntarily* paid by one-third of the incumbents of the Church of England out of their professional income, not to relieve themselves from parochial work, but to get more parochial work done than they can do, or are bound to do, themselves.

Taking, then, the net incomes of the beneficed clergy at 3,000,000*l.*, we find that one-third of them—those who employ curates—are spending out of their professional income of 1,000,000*l.* no less than 400,000*l.* a year, or 40 per cent., for pure zeal in the work of God and the Church.

No other class of men in the universe can be shown to be doing anything so generous and self-denying as this; and, we may add, nothing but the greatness of the cause they toil for could induce so large and constant a self-sacrifice. Of course there are known to be many beneficed men of private wealth who spend far more than their whole clerical income in the work of the parishes they are set over, as also there are known to be many of what seem to be the richest livings in England of which it is equally well known that no poor

[1] The general information on pp. 1–72 inclusive of the *Winchester Diocesan Calendar*, which, we believe, is prefixed in block to the calendars of many other dioceses, gives (under the summary of the bishopric, p. 16) the number of benefices as 529 and of curates as 400. The figures we have quoted above are careful corrections of these hasty generalizations, and show the existence of a much smaller proportion of curates to beneficed men than is commonly supposed to obtain.

[2] Against which we set *all clerical contributions* to curate-paying societies.

man can accept the charge at all.[1] This is one of the simple explanations of what ignorant enemies of the Church and her rulers make such an empty but mischievous outcry over, when, time after time, a bishop appoints to a large living some scion of nobility, or person otherwise supposed to be wealthily provided, and leaves a number of 'poor curates' unpromoted. But, apart from all such rich men who bring their gifts into the treasury, the vast majority of the curate-employing incumbents are bringing their ungrudged mites and doing for their parishes to the very utmost of their means and far beyond their duty. To add to these unsupported men's burden of providing stipends for curates, which the public generally lays upon them, while unwilling to touch it with a finger, the cost of providing pensions as well as stipends would be laying on indeed the familiar 'last straw' to break the camel's back.

But it would be much more than a straw. As the average duration of ministerial life is forty years (the average age of the clergy at death being sixty-four), to provide pensions would be to add to present burdens the cost of four years of life—that is, one-tenth, or ten per cent. of clerical existence—and this would not be in the power, however readily it might be in the will, of the beneficed clergy. If, therefore, any such measure became a law, the overburdening would correct itself, like a top-heavy iceberg, but in a way which, while relieving the clergy, would injure the laity. The man (and there are thousands such) who, doing his utmost possible to pay curates' stipends, was called on to do the utterly impossible in order to pension them, would simply diminish the responsibility and cost of providing pensions by ceasing to employ curates to claim them; there would be less Church work done, fewer posts for curates to occupy, smaller earnings, more need of pensions, and smaller contributions to levy for their supply. Under these peculiar circumstances anything like a general taxation of all clerical incomes, in order to provide retiring allowances, seems entirely out of the question, however reasonable such a measure might be in numberless other occupations where the employment of labour is an investment on the employer's part essential to his worldly profit, not (as, for the most part, in the appointment of curates in the Church) a self-denial on the employer's part carried already, for godliness and not for gain, to the very last verge of possibility,

[1] Instance Pontefract Vicarage, nominal net value 330*l.* A late wealthy vicar collected no tithe at all for more than twenty-five years; all tithes are now refused, and the endowment practically extinguished.

and susceptible of no greater expenditure than is so nobly borne to-day.

II. These various suggested measures of supplying a pension fund for the clergy appearing, as they do to us, on closer examination as well inadequate if permitted, impracticable if accepted, and injurious if practicable, we may dismiss them under the general conviction that any such provision for the needs of the clergy of to-day proposed to be subtracted from the small provision made ages ago for the subsistence of half as many clergy as we now have in supply of one-tenth of our present population, would be simply, as to its equity, a robbing of Peter to pay Paul, and, as to its reasonableness, as wise as to urge on a grown man the duty of keeping himself thoroughly warm with a baby's frock. It is not because the clergy are dependent-spirited, but because sufficient provision for retirement and pension from existing Church endowments is impossible, that every scheme proposed for effecting so urgently desirable an object must look beyond existing Church endowments for part at least of the means required. In a word, they would all call upon the laity to take a share in the provision of a fund. And most fairly and reasonably, as we shall now endeavour to show.

There never probably has been a race of men so completely pauperized, in the ministerial sense, as the laity of the Church of England. More than a thousand years ago certain people whom we call our ancestors, but cannot really prove to have been so, endowed the Church of England (which the law of England adopted and fitted itself to, but never really *established* at all) with the tithes of the land. Those men did the Christian duty of providing sustenance for Church workers. They gave up the tithe of *their* land for ever. No generation of Englishmen has ever done the like thing since. Each in succession they have been content to live, so far as the provision of spiritual ministrations goes, on the parochial alms of their predecessors. From time immemorial, by a universal prescription, the English people have been taught to claim spiritual sustenance (as many centuries later they were taught by our Poor Law to claim bodily sustenance) not from their own, but from other people's, purses. That some, and even many, especially in our own days and in the last half-century, have given nobly and gloriously of their goods for Church purposes is worthy of acknowledgment and redounds to their credit; but the credit, after all, is of a negative sort, since their act is only comparatively noble, showing them not liberal above their conscientious

duty, but liberal only above the illiberality of their unconscientious neighbours. And these men are exceptions, after all; the vast mass of the people who claim and use the ministrations of the Church of England do practically nothing at all towards its support. Witness to this fact is to be found in the extreme difficulty, especially in country parishes, of scraping together, by offertories or voluntary subscriptions, even the fractional sums required each year, not for the stipends of the ministers, but for the small necessary expenses of maintaining the fabrics and the services.

The effect of this spiritual pauperization is plain, whatever its source, though we cannot doubt that ignorance on the subject (which the clergy, from comprehensible delicacy of feeling, are shy to enlighten) has much to do with the parsimony so painfully evident.

For when a nominal member of the Church joins any one of the sects he passes (indeed, is compelled to pass) from spiritual pauperism to spiritual independence at once, and does not hesitate to pay his fair contribution to the support of his chosen minister and the repair or purchase of his favourite chapel.

Therefore we should enlighten the ignorance which exists on these points among our Church members, and open their eyes to the imperative and reasonable call upon them to do their share in aiding the efficiency of the Church and the independence of her ministers by contribution, if not to the endowment of the beneficed man, at least to the pensioning of the unbeneficed, the worn-out men whose lives have been spent in the service of the Church, admittedly without sufficient remuneration.

Such systematic enlightenment would, no doubt, stimulate a good many of our Church people at all events to comprehend their duty in this direction, though of course the mere pointing out of the duty is but a small matter as compared with getting the duty done.

Every scheme for bettering the condition of the clergy which we have ever heard of (and they are very many) uses the arguments we have used, and draws the perhaps natural if too sanguine inference, 'Our people have only to hear these things, and they will be sure to remedy the wrong which exists.' But it is too often forgotten that good meanings come to nothing unless married to good methods. Some machinery is wanted to elicit, collect, secure, and apportion those sums which we are always so ready to assume that the awakened liberality of our Church members will be willing to contribute.

Such a machinery, the oldest, the most reasonable, the most legitimate known, exists at our hands, a slight modification, not in the form but in the use of which, suggested nearly ten years ago by the Rev. Prebendary Wood, of Christ Church, Bath, might be instrumental in vastly stimulating the clergy to efforts which all men should be encouraged to make of their own accord, by way of provision against want in old age. This machinery, we need hardly say, is the offertory of our Church, and we cannot but express surprise that a proposal so reasonable and so hopeful should so long have been before the public without some steps being taken by thoughtful and influential men to carry its simple and reasonable suggestions into effect.

Premising that we shall put forward somewhat modified ideas as to the application of such a fund when raised, we will quote, as regards the method of raising it, from Prebendary Wood's interesting pamphlet on the subject, the title of which, *Church Finance*, we have cited at the head of our article.

'It is proposed,' he says, 'that a fund be raised, towards which a portion of the alms made at each Sacramental collection should be contributed. This will be strictly in accordance with Holy Scripture, for both under the Old as well as under the New Testament provision was to be made for God's ministers. Under the Old Testament both the priest and the Levite were to be provided for under settled ordinances by God's own appointment; and even care and consideration were to be extended towards the aged and worn-out ministers of God. Under the New we have ample directions given in the Apostolic writings; and we have them enshrined for use in the most important formulary of the Church. Now if these sentences of the Communion Service were constantly used,[1] and *one-tenth of all Sacramental alms collected for the poor were set apart for the sick and disabled clergy*, who but must admit that such a division and appropriation would be both reasonable and suitable? If this were once established it will naturally be self-sustaining and flow on, and the only effort will be to remit the money once or twice a year to the diocesan treasurer. The words of Holy Scripture *always used in the Offertory at the Holy Communion* will of themselves plead with power, and we believe with efficacy, on behalf of the sick and disabled clergy.'

Is there any objection to be made to such a proposal as this? Let us see before going further. It would deprive the poor of a portion of the Church's alms, is the first objection; it would be robbing them to enrich the clergy. Firstly, we

[1] As a fact, just because the alms are never thus applied, the most salient and striking texts in the Offertory are systematically passed over unread. We mean, of course, the 6th, 7th, 8th, 10th, 11th, and 14th.

reply that this does not follow in the least; the putting such a just, righteous, and beneficent object before our congregations may far more reasonably be assumed likely to augment the collections than to diminish them; and to uphold this argument for a moment on logical grounds will compel an objector to give a definition of 'the poor,' from which he will find it very hard to exclude hundreds of struggling, toiling, almost starving unbeneficed men, for whose absolute want, when their working days are over, the whole body of Churchmen should contribute some fraction of provision.

Or, again, we may hear, 'This will deprive the clergy of a tenth part of their means of aiding temporal distress among their congregations.' We can only say with all the emphasis in our power that their deprivation of the other nine-tenths as well would be one of the greatest practical advantages to their influence and the work of the Church which can readily be conceived. The 'serving of tables' by the clergy, which is so general in the Church of England, is a cruel waste of ministerial energy, while it fills their deserving poor with a sense of injustice and their undeserving with hypocrisy and deceit. There are no worse almoners than our unfortunate clergy, and the fact of their being so at all has wofully corrupted our people. Many of these measure their minister by his money and not by his morals; we have taught them a far worse simony than that so commonly misdescribed under the name, so that men who are ready to give heed to a Simon Magus, who scatters shillings, as the great power of God, would despise a Simon Peter who should repeat to-day, 'Silver and gold have I none, but such as I have give I thee.'

Can any other objections be thought of against this reasonable use of a tenth part of the offertory? We doubt it; and as, after all, it is only those who contribute the offertory who have the slightest right to object, there is no reason, should one such qualified objector exist, why he should not specially assign his offering, if he think fit, to any strictly parochial use he may prefer. The reasonableness of the theory is clear. A great step might be made at any time by the bishops (if possible simultaneously) notifying their opinion, either by a resolution in Convocation or through their rural deans, that some such use of a part of the offertory was both primitive, reasonable, and desirable.

Thus we have indicated a source whence the nucleus of a fund for clergy pensions might flow. The argument for its collection would be immensely strengthened if it were made clear from the first to the contributors that their benefactions

were intended to elicit, not to extinguish, vigorous efforts on the part of the clergy to make independent provision for themselves. Therefore, as it seems to us, so far as this money is applied to pensions, it should *in no one case* be allotted unless met by a corresponding effort on the part of the intending pensioner or on his behalf.

Again, the proportion contributed to the fund by any parish may be reasonably supposed likely to be larger if the contributors were distinctly aware that the money they gave would in the first instance benefit their own unbeneficed clergy, a condition which would be attached to all remittances. And the same result in a further degree would probably flow from their understanding that the advantage offered to their own curate would be definite and unprecarious, giving him not the means merely of paying one or two annual premiums, which he might forfeit by future inability to keep up, but securing for each year of his parochial service a paid-up and inalienable claim to a certain definite sum, say 10*l.*, conditional only on his reaching a certain definite age, say sixty years, and not being holder of a benefice.

We will suppose, then, the origination of such a fund as has been described, to be drawn from, say, one-tenth of the offertory collections throughout the country, and handed over to a corporation for administration. This might well be that organization already in existence for promoting a different object, the Curates' Augmentation Fund, which might add the words 'and Pension' before 'Fund' in its title. We suggest this because this new fund would be based on the certainty of a very large surplus, which might in time be used, most properly, in extending the special augmentation of curates' stipends, which that society is formed to promote. Of course we do not assume that all, or any special number, of the parishes in England will by their ministers and churchwardens fall in with the idea of tithing the Sacramental collections for the purpose of clergy superannuation; the benefits of the scheme we propose will be only shared by the parishes which do; but we will by-and-by show reason to hope that the benefits offered will be sufficient to induce most parishes which have the advantage of a curate's services to contribute in the manner proposed.

III. We come, thirdly, to consider the statistical bases on which the payments for such an assurance would be founded, and the calculations required to establish the proposed rate of contributions and ensure the promised amount of benefit. We will suppose such a corporation established, to receive

the proportional collection from the Sacramental offertories of any parishes which are willing to contribute to the fund. We have already calculated that curates are employed, on an average, in the case of one parish out of three in the country; and the fact of the employment of a curate for the most part implies a considerable population—let us say, on the average, 2,000 persons. Where these populations do not consist of the very poorest classes it cannot be an unreasonable calculation to place the average Sacramental offertories at a yearly amount of, let us say, 50*l.* or more; a tenth of this would give 5*l.* a year or more for the proposed fund. Let us next see how this should be dealt with. The trustees of the fund would bind themselves to offer annually, on receipt of this sum of at least 5*l.*, that sum to the curate of the parish (if he had served it for the preceding twelve months), *on condition of his meeting* that amount with a supplementary sum sufficient to complete a so-called 'positive' assurance with the trustees of 10*l.* a year, conditional on his completing the age of sixty and not holding any benefice. (It may be noted, in passing, that his having held a benefice and resigned it will by no means vitiate his claim for pension, and that, should he, after becoming a pensioner, accept a living, he only forfeits the pension while holding the living, and can reclaim it when he resigns.) So long as the parish contributes at least 5*l.* yearly to the fund, the curate will receive the same offer annually until he have secured ten positive pensions of 10*l.* a year, amounting together to 100*l.* a year. In this way the fund can never fail, for it will never issue a pension not fully paid up in advance, and the curate who leaves one parish for another will have received for each year of his service in each parish in which he has worked an equal proportion of supplement to prevent his coming to want in old age. There need be no feeling of the eleemosynary sort in such an arrangement; no valuers of Eucharistic privileges would ever feel otherwise than that the labourer is worthy of his hire, and many of them would contribute gladly and largely besides to such a fund as is suggested if based on sound and infallible principles.

Nor should any false pride make the recipient, even if otherwise provided, hesitate to avail himself of that recognition of service which his work would have earned. For the advantage of his order, and of his brethren less well provided than himself, he should, on the contrary, not only accept, but stipulate with his rector for having, the offer made to him each year by the trustees, whether he refused and left the sum to swell the fund or proceeded to secure his pension.

If, on the other hand, a curate, having this offer made to him year by year, refuse to accept it from simple unwillingness to make any effort whatever on his own account for the securing of a provision for his old age, he would only have himself, and not the Church or the flocks he has served, to blame for his destitution, while the sum refused would swell the fund for wiser men.

But, it may be said, this proposed method of collecting 5*l.* a year for ten years of each curate's working life from each parish in which a curate is employed, assumes, if it is to offer its great benefits to every curate, as it ought, that the offertories in every such parish must amount to 50*l.* a year, and that there are to be no parishes with more than one curate. We must meet this reasonable objection. It is presumable that where more curates are needed there are more communicants to contribute, and that the offertories will be proportionally larger. But this is met by saying that some large parishes will be too poor at all times to contribute. We would ask then who provides their curates' stipend. In such cases we shall find them very commonly derived from the Additional Curates Society, the Pastoral-Aid Society, and other sources for spiritual aid. Why should not these stipulate in making their grants to deduct from the grant enough to supplement the deficiency of 5*l.* to be offered to the curate whose stipend they provide at the end of each year of his service? For the great advantage of the Church herself, and the curates as well, such a stipulation might most reasonably be made. It may be said this would be to make the curate pay the whole sum; but this would not really be the case if these societies subjected all their grants to this reasonable condition until each recipient had secured his ten pensions.

And this modification is of course only suggested in the case of such very poor parishes as could not be hoped to produce 5*l.* from their offertory for each curate. The societies might reasonably, taking such a point as this into consideration, make their grants a little larger, for this very purpose, to the poorest parishes, and proportionally smaller to those better able to contribute the required sum from the offertory.

And, again, the machinery of the proposed fund might be made use of by anybody who, from regard or gratitude, wished to provide a paid-up pension, or part of one, to any curate; he might simply pay the money, and the society would send the completed policy to the curate. It would be inalienable and secure, and would leave the parish contributions from offertory free for other purposes of the fund.

That the fund itself must grow, and grow largely, is plain from the following considerations. Firstly, if once generally adopted with episcopal sanction and recommendation (and what bishop would fail to welcome and foster such an undertaking?), a vast number of parishes which have no curates would send at least *something* a year as a tenth of their offertory. Again, very many parishes sending a tenth would send a very much larger sum than would supply 5*l.* for offering pensions to each of their own curates. Thirdly, many well-provided men would, in one way or another, prevent themselves from burdening the fund at all, giving back, so to speak, with the one hand what they received with the other. Fourthly, the offertory tenths of all parishes whose curates had secured ten 10*l.* pensions would swell the fund without deduction; and, fifthly, the very existence of a system so hopeful and reasonable would encourage many important gifts and legacies. We have it on the authority of more than one eminent lawyer that many clients at the present time, in making their testamentary arrangements, make earnest and often vain inquiries as to some good clergy fund, in order to benefit some special persons or parishes, and would gladly avail themselves for carrying out their intentions of such an institution as is here proposed.

All these considerations tend to show that the undertaking of such a business as here suggested by the Curates' Augmentation Fund would, so far from involving it in any risk, tend infallibly to the creation of a surplus, which, as often as ascertained, would aid the fund in a most important way towards carrying out fully its first declared object of bettering the condition of stipendiary curates of long service.

And, were this not sufficient, the tabulations we have made for the proposed assurance cost being based, as we shall show, on payments largely exceeding the exact necessary cost, the contributors to the offertory collections might be perfectly secure that the tithe of their gifts would not only aid the pensioning of the curates who minister among them, but become largely instrumental besides in bettering the general condition of the beneficed clergy in other directions.

We come, lastly, to consider the amounts of contribution which would be required from the unbeneficed men to secure one by one this series of ten pensions, each of 10*l.* a year. Of course this sum must vary with the age at which the pensions are secured. A young man necessarily must pay much less than an older one, though towards middle clerical life we may point out a happy modification in further aid of

the individual effort required. By the Post Office tables a curate aged 24 next birthday, in order to secure a paid-up pension of 100*l.* at 60, would have to pay down 183*l.* 15*s.*; to secure a 10*l.* pension, 18*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.* But such a pension, the only cheap and safe one he could at all secure without such a machinery as we have suggested, would be his without conditions of any sort except his reaching the age of 60 years. As, however, the fund we suggest would condition its pensions by another stipulation—namely, that the clergyman receiving the pension shall be holding no benefice—and as two out of three of the whole number of clergy hold benefices, and, generally speaking, far more than two out of three over 60 years old do, it is plain that with such conditioning one-third of the Post Office money would be sufficient to buy the pensions in a society established *ad hoc.* Therefore, for the curate after twelve months' work to buy a paid-up pension of 10*l.* would cost 6*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.*; if, then, 5*l.* be offered to him by the fund he will only himself need to supplement it by 1*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.* That is to say, in practice he will be offered a value, otherwise unrealizable, of 18*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.* for the small amount of 1*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.* The man who will refuse this will have no right, when he grows old, to complain of want of provision.

This, of course, is the lowest rate, and must increase in each successive year, so that, at the age of 34 next birthday, when buying his tenth and last pension, he would have to add 4*l.* 9*s.* 9*d.* to the 5*l.*, instead of 1*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.* As it is very plain that the older the man grows the more he wants to do with his money, we would therefore suggest that each man, in paying for his first pension, should, instead of the smaller sum for the special year, pay the *average* sum for each of ten years, and thus supplement the 5*l.* offer by 2*l.* 12*s.* 3*d.* each year, instead of by 1*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.* the first, increasing to 4*l.* 9*s.* 9*d.* the last year. We will see next how this proposal would affect older men. The following are the first and the *average* supplements to be undertaken by pension buyers at the undermentioned ages, and the Post Office real value in each case obtainable by the money :—

Age	Benefaction	First Year	Ten Years' Average	Real Value, Post Office
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
30	5 0 0	3 3 10	4 19 5	24 11 0
32	5 0 0	4 4 2	6 7 6	26 8 4
34	5 0 0	4 9 9	6 17 5	28 18 4
36	5 0 0	5 10 7	8 0 10	31 11 8
40	10 0 0	2 12 6	5 13 3	37 17 6

As already hinted, and as this table shows, a modification specially advantageous to the older men comes into operation about the age of 40; for then the unbeneficed men become, after 15 years' service, eligible for grants from that very fund, to which for this special reason we would affiliate the insurances, the Curates' Augmentation; and though that society might not be able to give each of them its proposed 100*l.* a year additional income, it might most reasonably give each of them 5*l.* to be applied towards purchasing pensions up to 100*l.* at 60, which would set the Augmentation Fund free from further grants in the case of all who survived for pension. Thus, supposing a curate aged 40 to have made no pension assurance before, he might, by paying 5*l.* odd a year for ten years, in complement of 5*l.* from his parish *and* 5*l.* from the Curates' Augmentation Fund, be certain of 100*l.* pension whether he continued to work as a curate or retired from clerical work altogether at 60 years of age.

What, however, would be done in the case of parishes which made no offertory tithe, and thus failed to provide a means of pension for the curates from whose services they received benefit? The practical effect, if the plan were generally taken up, would be to raise the ordinary stipend required for a curate's services in such parishes by 5*l.* a year, since in most other parishes the curate could count on receiving a money value of 5*l.* in addition to the ordinary stipend. The curate serving such a parish would receive 5*l.* a year more than otherwise, and if he chose might spend that sum, with its supplement, in buying each year a 10*l.* pension. Otherwise he would have no pension, of course, but could blame no one but himself for his neglect.

It is not unreasonable that we should be expected to enter into some detail, which need not be uninteresting, of the grounds on which we are bold to assert that pensions, paid up in one sum, for unbeneficed clergy may be issued, not only with perfect financial safety, but with great financial advantage, at one-third of the ordinary cost of unconditioned pensions, by such a corporation as we have indicated. Broadly taken, we have estimated that, as there are more than twice as many benefices (and presumably beneficed men to hold them) in the Church of England than there are unbeneficed men, we can therefore estimate further that, if only one in every three could be at the same time unbeneficed, a system which receives payment from all the individuals of a class, while only every third one can draw the benefit, may be established at a third of the ordinary cost. We shall show

presently statistical reasons proving even this third a high estimate.

But we shall be met by the assertion that, though the proposal may embrace all the clergy, a large enough number will, of their own accord, remain outside it, to vitiate the calculations; or, in other words, that a large number of men will be so satisfied of never requiring a pension at all that they will not contribute to the funds.

There might be some force in this objection if all men were able to know beforehand what posts they would obtain in the Church. But as, in order to establish such a fund as we propose on a sound financial basis, we do not for a moment require its universal adoption, but only to calculate the average ministerial history of the average Church of England clergyman, the proportion of those who may or may not avail themselves of the proposal does not in the least appreciable degree affect the average cost at which all who do, be their number large or small, may be assured. We have, in order to find a sound basis for estimate, made two inductions, each of one thousand consecutive names of clergymen, as they stand in the pages of *Crockford* for 1881, selecting the two lists from different parts of the book (pp. 482–528 and 906–951).

We have taken the average age of ordination as twenty-five years, and, as the volume for 1881 contains only the names of clergy existing in 1880, we have gone back thirty-five years—that is, to the year 1845—and find the number of men ordained in or before that year (that is, of sixty years of age), to be 406 out of the 2,000.

Incidentally we may remark also a very strong contrast in the value of livings held by clergy after their sixtieth year and those held by all clergy at all ages.

The Rev. A. Mackreth Deane, an authority already quoted, estimates the number of livings held by *all clergy at all ages*, with income under 200*l.* a year, to be about 5,573, as compared with 7,727 livings so held of a higher value; we may take his numbers approximately as 5 to 7.

But our own induction shows the number of livings held by *clergy above* 60 *years of age* with income under 200*l.* to be only 63 as compared with 276 livings so held of a higher value, or approximately as 5 to 22.

This extraordinary difference, so likely to be overlooked in any hasty view of the subject, is at once explained when we remember that each promotion a man receives as he grows older naturally moves him on, from holding smaller

benefices in his younger days, to holding larger ones in his older.

However arising, it must manifestly cheapen the insurance cost proposed to a considerable degree. There would, however, be necessarily a large correction required to meet stimulated resignation, since the power to claim pension, if unbeneficed, at 60 years of age would induce most holders of the smaller livings, say under 100*l.* a year, to retire at 60, and of those under, say, 200*l.* to retire at 66, which appears to be the average age at which retirements due to physical infirmity take place.[1] But, seeing how few clergy of pension age hold small enough livings to be induced to retire for a 100*l.* pension, the correction of the estimate as applies to men above 60 years of age would be vastly smaller than as applied to all ages.

We give a table containing the result of our inductions, which will enable a simple calculation to be made of the average number of persons contributing to such a pension fund as we have proposed who would ultimately become chargeable to its funds.

Number of clergy examined		2,000
Number of those above 60 years		406
1. Of whom holding livings under 200*l.* net* .	63	
2. „ holding livings over 200*l.* net* .	276	
3. „ retired from benefices . . .	36	
4. „ otherwise provided . . .	15	
5. „ never beneficed	16	
	—	406
7. Average years served by retired incumbents .		41

* Besides value of residences.

Noting the remarkable fact that only sixteen men out of 2,000 ordained reach the age of 60 without being beneficed (for the fifteen in class 4, called 'otherwise provided,' are either holders of public positions equivalent to benefices or entitled to pensions for public service, which should be made to exclude from participation in the assurance fund in the same way as the holding of a benefice does), we proceed to apply the tabulation. Taking the gross result of this table first, we see that, out of 406 individuals of the pension age, classes 1 and 2, together holding 339 benefices, and class 4, the fifteen men 'otherwise provided,' or together 354 individuals, would be

[1] The signal incidental advantage of this consideration, as tending in a remarkable degree to shorten the average of unbeneficed service, by hastening the resignation of the smaller livings by aged men, must not be left out of view.

disqualified, by holding benefices, from claiming pension; leaving class 3, the clergy retired from benefices, and class 5, those never beneficed, together 52, entitled to draw upon the fund. In round numbers, only one in every eight could make good his claim; therefore, presumably, as little as an eighth part of the ordinary Post Office sum would suffice to secure the provision.

But we must make here some liberal corrections regarding the important question of the increase in resignations of livings, and consequently of drawers upon the fund which this right to pension would induce.

Our return under class 3 gives us the proportion of those over 60 now voluntarily retired as 36 to 406, say 1 to 11. But their retirement, as the entry under 6 shows, has not been at 60 years of age. The average length of service from ordination to retirement of these thirty-six individuals has been forty-one years, which added to twenty-five, which we have assumed (very liberally) as the average age of ordination, would make out each of these to have retired, from physical incapacity, at 66 years of age. The expectation of life at 60 being thirteen and a half years, it is plain that the pension fund would only be burdened by class 3 from the age of 66, not from the age of 60; and the expectation of life of persons reaching 66 being ten years, the cost of class 3 to the fund would be as ten to thirteen and a half. Turning this proportion into persons instead of cost, we find that the thirty-six retired at 66 would equal 27·66, equal to, say, twenty-seven retired at 60 and claiming pension.

We turn next to class 5, the never beneficed. It might be assumed that every one of these should claim the pension. But here, again, a correction must be made. In seven cases out of these sixteen there is no record whatever of more than two years' Church work having been done in the whole life from ordination. These are presumably men of fortune, who for one cause or another have left the calling altogether. Supposing these to have secured pensions on the plan proposed *while in work*, they would each be able to claim only two pensions of 10*l.* each, so that the united chargeability of these seven on the fund would be only 140*l.*, not so much as two individuals, for whom we will allow them to count. The number, then, to claim under class 5 is reduced by five, from sixteen to eleven.

We come next to the question of resignations stimulated by the right to the pension. We may assume that a right to 100*l.* a year, if unbeneficed, will not be sufficient to induce

the resignation at any earlier time than ordinary (the cases of which we have treated under class 3) of livings worth over 200*l.* a year net with residences.

It may be, and ought to be, different with livings below that value. Their number is 63. We will assume that half of these (say those worth only 100*l.* a year net) will be resigned directly on the incumbent reaching 60 years of age (and this calculation is also a very liberal one, *very few indeed* of these benefices being under 100*l.* a year). Let us say, then, that 31 of these will be immediately resigned. Of the remainder, 32, we can only assume that they will be resigned for the sake of pension when it becomes necessary for the incumbent to pay a curate; that is, they will be resigned from physical incapacity. We will treat these, then, as we have treated class 3, and assume them all to be resigned at the age of 66. The chargeability of their incumbents on the pension fund being reduced, in the proportion already shown, from 27 to 20, we may place their number as 23·7—say 24.

Let us next, having treated these various separate points, apply them to our table, and find out what exact proportion the claimants on the fund will bear to the 406 individuals under observation aged 60 years and over. They will consist of—

Class 1	(31 + 24)	55
3	. . . . .	27
5	. . . . .	11
		93

This gives a proportion of claimants on the fund to contributors of 93 to 406, almost exactly of 1 to $4\frac{1}{3}$; so that, as far as can be judged from our two large inductions of 1,000 each, the pensions proposed to be granted might be safely undertaken at much less than one-fourth part of the ordinary cost of a Post Office pension.

We shall probably excite here a remark in disparagement of the conditions we have put forward for these pensions: namely, that to charge contributors a third of the ordinary Post Office price, while the net cost of each pension would be only one-fourth of it, would be extravagant. We answer this by saying that the net cost would be even less still, and yet that the charge of a third will be reasonable.

For we have shown in a previous part of our article that, while no pension would ever be granted not fully paid up in advance, a great deal of money would accrue to the fund from offertory tithe in parishes (1) where no curates were

employed, (2) where the curate or curates for the time being had already secured ten pensions of 10*l.* each, and (3) where the offertory tithe exceeded the exact sum of 5*l.* to be offered to each curate for insuring. But another considerable source of profit would accrue to the fund. This insurance money, all paid in advance, would fructify at a much higher interest than that estimated in the Post Office tables for comparatively short and precarious insurances. The Post Office rate of interest for deferred annuities is 3½ per cent.; there is no reason why the Curates' Augmentation Fund should not secure safe interest at 4 per cent. instead. The Clergy Mutual Society, for instance, as sound an institution probably as exists in the universe, invests its whole funds at an average interest of 4*l.* 3*s.* 10*d.* Therefore, allowing a reasonable margin for expense of management to the Augmentation Fund, the many sources of appreciation we have shown will fully justify us in estimating that even one-fifth, instead of one-third, of the Post Office rate for pensions would suffice for securing the limited pension proposed. Why, then, require nearly twice the money from contributors?

The answer is, in order to create a larger and growing fund for giving further and additional advantages to the unbeneficed and poorer clergy. We have only in this article considered pensions, leaving quite out of view the life insurances by which so many poor clergy so earnestly desire and so zealously labour to make provision for helpless ones they may have to leave behind them.

Till the poor man's *own* means of existence be made secure by pension, his life insurance for his family, depending on his own existence and earnings, *cannot be secured*; but, if once the pension be gained, the large increments of the fund might be applied by its managers in giving to the men, already provided with pension, proper and welcome proportional aids in their then more hopeful efforts at making provision for their families.

This may explain why a larger sum than actually required should be asked for the pension insurance; it does not answer the allegation that it renders the pension difficult to secure by increasing its cost. The answer to this is found in the fact which we have indicated when stating the separate rates to be paid at separate ages, that even though paying twice as much as the actual cost to such an organization as we have described, the purchaser of a pension through the means we have indicated will be receiving for a very small sum a very large money value, otherwise absolutely unob-

tainable, the real value of the 10*l.* pension for which at twenty-four he would pay 1*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.* being 18*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.*, and the real worth of the same pension for which at forty he would pay 5*l.* 13*s.* 3*d.* being 37*l.* 17*s.* 6*d.*

We commend the study of this important subject to our readers. It seems to offer great advantages to the very classes among our Church workers who most need and deserve them, while putting their winning on the proper basis of self-help and outside justice. A careful study of the matter will, we trust, in due time induce some influential members of the Church of England to move in this matter, on the lines first suggested by the Rev. Prebendary Wood. Once the altogether reasonable proposal made by him of tithing the Sacramental offertories meets, as it must meet, the approval both of bishops and congregations, and a method, such as we have advocated, of investing, securing, and complementing these contributions has been provided, a brighter day will have dawned for the prospects of our less fortunate Church workers and those dependent upon them; while Church members, on the other hand, will, almost unconsciously, and with hardly any greater appreciable exertion than at present, be wiping away the dark reproach now resting upon them of leaving so many worthy men to want and disappointment, either from lack of will to help them or from lack of knowing how.

ART. VIII.—THE INCREASE OF THE EPISCOPATE.

An Act to provide for the foundation of four new bishoprics in England. 1878.

WHAT are the most marked deficiencies of our episcopacy? What additions or modifications does our present form of episcopacy require in order to render it more in accordance with the idea of a New Testament and primitive episcopacy, and to enable it to discharge efficiently its spiritual duties under the present necessities and altered condition of the Church? Is it at all probable that the Act of 1878 will supply them?

At the time of the Norman Conquest there were nineteen bishoprics in England and Wales. These had not been created all at once, but gradually. Of these nineteen bishoprics six were founded by the Britons, the other thirteen were founded after the reintroduction of Christianity from Rome by Augustine in the year 596. The usual estimate given of the population of England and Wales at the Conquest is 1,000,000. At its *highest* estimate the population then was 1,250,000. If we suppose the dioceses in England to have been twice as populous as those in Wales at the time of the Conquest, we have at that time an aggregate of 70,000 for each English and 35,000 for each Welsh diocese. The Welsh dioceses were Bangor, Llandaff, S. David's, and S. Asaph, the same as at the present day, all founded before Augustine came in 596. At the commencement of the Reformation the population had increased to 4,000,000. Two bishoprics, Ely and Carlisle, had been added. At the death of Henry VIII. there were twenty-six bishops; Gloucester, Bristol, Oxford, Peterborough, and Chester had been added. The Reformers saw the necessity of a more complete and efficient episcopal supervision. Consequently an Act was passed for the creation of ten more sees immediately after the creation of the five above mentioned. This Act was repealed in the first and second of Philip and Mary. In addition to these Henry VIII. had an Act passed for the creation of twenty-six additional suffragan bishops. This Act stands unrepealed. In Henry VIII.'s time, now three

centuries and a half ago, there were twenty-six bishoprics actually existing, and Acts were passed for the creation and establishment of thirty-six more. In all provision was made by law for sixty-two bishoprics. But the Act for suffragans, though unrepealed, remained a dead letter upon the statute book until 1836, a period of 300 years. In the year 1836 Ripon was created, being transformed from a collegiate to a cathedral church. But Gloucester and Bristol were at the same time united. Since that time five other bishoprics have been created—Manchester, Truro, S. Albans, Liverpool, and Newcastle. These with the ancient bishopric of Sodor and Man raise the number to thirty-two. To this estimate must again be added the four suffragan bishops of Dover, Nottingham, Bedford, and Colchester. In all thirty-six bishops. The population of England and Wales on Sunday, April 4, 1881, was 25,968,286; in round numbers 26,000,000. With this vast increase of population in the course of eight centuries, from 1,250,000 at the highest estimate to 26,000,000, there are only seventeen more bishops, including suffragans, for episcopal administration, than there were 800 years ago. Eight of the dioceses now exceed 1,000,000 in population, and one of them, London, has a population of 2,500,000, twice the entire population of England and Wales united at the time of the Conquest. This condition for a Church professedly episcopal seems a most anomalous one. Nor can this condition be relieved in any way by the plea that travelling is now greatly facilitated. The present times are very different from the times of the Conquest. By the very facility for travelling, and still more by the invention of printing, the diffusion of intelligence among the masses, and the general mental activity of the times, the calls and duties of the episcopate are now more than correspondingly increased.

But the contrast is still more to our disadvantage when we know from authentic records that 'every diocese in olden times, besides its own bishop, had a suffragan bishop, and frequently two or three suffragans at one time. Bishop Longland of Lincoln (1529 A.D.) had three at the same time, and he assigned as a reason for them in his petition to the Pope the great extent of his diocese.'[1] Harmer in his *Specimen of Errors*, quoted by Canon Dixon at the Derby Church Congress, says, 'There seemeth to have been a suffragan bishop in every diocese of England save Carlisle, Rochester, and the Welsh dioceses, and in several more than one.' The

[1] The Rev. Alfred Jones's pamphlet on *Increase of Episcopacy*.

Suffragan Act itself states, 'Suffragans have been accustomed to be had within this realm for the more speedy administration of the sacraments.'

Such a state of our episcopacy stands in very marked contrast with its condition in the primitive Church. 'From the small province of Proconsular Asia—the post-Diocletian Proconsular Asia is referred to—which was about the same size as Lincolnshire, forty-two bishops were present at an early council. In the only half-converted province of North Africa 470 episcopal towns are now known.'[1] In France of the present day, with a population only about one-third in excess of our own, there are ninety bishops, or three times the number that there are in England.

If the question were asked of the clergy of the Church in what official sphere they find the episcopacy to be especially inadequate to the necessities of the Church at the present day, the reply would almost unanimously be, The want is *most felt* in the administration of confirmation. To most of the clergy the gatherings for a confirmation are their most painful and disappointing ministerial experiences. Such gatherings of candidates from many parishes, and oftentimes from considerable distances, prove most unfitting for the administration of so solemn an ordinance. All the sightseers of the place and neighbourhood gather on such occasions. The herding together of confirmation candidates from many unconnected parishes keeps very many back from confirmation altogether, and thus many who would become and remain members of the Church go to swell the ranks of the indifferent or become Nonconformists. Many of mature years have been kept back from presenting themselves on account of the ordeal which they are called upon to pass through. They are willing to confess Christ before men, but they ask, 'Are we called upon to make our solemn profession of faith in Christ in such indiscriminate gatherings as those in which confirmation is usually administered?' The Church has herself expressly enjoined in her rubric, 'And there shall none be admitted to the Holy Communion until such time as he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed.' This one rite alone, to ensure its more frequent and more reverent administration, and to remove the stumbling-blocks which these heterogeneous assemblies cause in the minds of the mature, and more sensitive, and more thoughtful, calls for an immediate and a sufficient extension of the episcopacy.

[1] Hatch's *Bampton Lectures* for 1880, p. 78.

TABLE I.

	1880		1881		Number of Churches
	Number of Confirmations	Number Confirmed	Number of Confirmations	Number Confirmed	
Canterbury . . .	85	5,895	94	6,173	411
York	41	6,890	52	7,396	628
London . . .	106	15,539	111	15,525	469
Durham . . .	44	5,806	38	5,016	386
Winchester . . .	95	7,681	92	7,345	529
Bath and Wells . .	40	4,830	40	4,070	497
Carlisle . . .	49	4,591	12	1,172	293
Chester . . .	95	15,048	66	7,502	426
Chichester . . .	67	7,155	29	2,585	330
Ely	50	5,398	56	5,133	554
Exeter	102	6,034	101	5,791	499
Gloucester and Bristol .	68	7,003	70	6,327	478
Hereford . . .	43	2,461	50	3,218	410
Lichfield . . .	145	11,492	130	11,517	717
Lincoln . . .	85	6,435	81	5,901	810
Manchester . . .	52	8,708	77	15,183	466
Norwich . . .	40	4,070	46	5,053	914
Oxford	84	6,616	91	7,612	614
Peterborough . .	44	5,408	48	5,896	570
Ripon	59	8,295	48	7,630	487
Rochester . . .	70	8,780	73	9,143	467
S. Albans . . .	77	5,462	68	7,661	593
Salisbury . . .	78	6,757	75	5,240	478
Truro	48	1,536	38	1,438	233
Worcester . . .	39	5,086	76	8,910	475

TABLE II.

Percentage Confirmed	Diocese	Population in 1871	Number arriving annually of an age to be Confirmed	Average number Confirmed in the two years 1880 and 1881	Average No. of Confirmations held	One Confirmation in every — of Population	One Confirmation in every — Churches
87	Salisbury . .	383,514	6,840	5,998	77	4,980	6
71	Oxford . .	552,770	9,990	7,114	88	6,278	7
68	Hereford . .	237,138	4,140	2,839	47	5,045	9
66	Chichester .	416,328	7,380	4,870	48	8,673	7
59	Canterbury .	567,091	10,080	6,034	89	6,371	4
57	Glo'ster & Bristol	637,028	11,520	6,665	69	9,232	7
57	Bath and Wells	430,326	7,740	4,453	40	10,758	12
57	Ely . . .	519,286	9,180	5,265	53	9,797	10
55	S. Albans .	660,117	11,880	6,561	73	9,042	8
54	Exeter . .	601,374	10,800	5,912	102	5,895	5
54	Peterborough .	532,937	9,540	5,152	46	11,585	12
52	Winchester .	800,000	14,400	7,513	94	8,510	5
47	Carlisle . .	334,786	6,012	2,881	32	10,462	9
47	Lichfield . .	1,356,869	24,300	11,504	138	9,832	5
45	Lincoln . .	757,491	13,500	6,168	83	9,126	9
39	Worcester .	980,982	17,640	6,998	58	16,913	8
38	Norwich . .	668,123	12,000	4,511	43	15,537	21
37	York . .	1,060,000	19,080	7,143	47	22,553	11
35	Chester . .	1,762,201	31,680	11,275	81	21,755	5
35	Manchester .	1,893,542	34,020	11,945	65	29,131	7
34	London . .	2,539,000	45,540	15,532	109	23,293	4
33	Rochester .	1,500,000	27,000	8,961	72	20,833	6
32	Ripon . .	1,357,000	24,300	7,962	54	25,129	9
28	Durham . .	1,077,569	19,180	5,411	41	26,000	9
23	Truro . .	362,343	6,480	1,487	43	8,428	5

The Archdeacon of Lindisfarne at a recent Durham Conference well expressed the present need. 'With regard to confirmations,' he said, 'the increased and increasing demands for the more frequent administration of this most important rite will not be satisfied with less than *annual*, *parochial*, and *personal* confirmations.'

In the Registrar-General's Report issued from Somerset House in January 1860 the following is given as the estimated numbers of the different ages, as taken from the census of 1851, when the population of England and Wales was returned as 20,959,457 :—

'Estimated numbers living in England and Wales in the middle of 1851 at the ages herein stated—

Ages	14	15	16	17	18
Persons	375,610	371,583	366,821	361,940	357,095

Somerset House :
Jan. 31, 1860.

GEORGE GRAHAM,
Registrar-General.'

If the population in England and Wales in 1851, 20,959,457, is divided by 371,583, the number at the age of 15 years, the age usually accepted by the bishops for confirmation, it gives one of 15 years of age in every 56 of the population, or 2 in every 112, or 180 in every 10,000 of the population. If this is used as a basis of calculation, and the number of confirmed in each diocese is tabulated, then a very accurate estimate may be drawn of the work which each diocese is doing in this matter among its population.

In Table I. we give the returns of the numbers confirmed in the years 1880 and 1881 in every diocese of England, together with the number of confirmations held in each diocese in each year and the number of churches in each diocese.

We have omitted the four Welsh dioceses, Bangor, Llandaff, S. Asaph, and S. David's. The number of confirmations held and the number of confirmed persons in the diocese of Liverpool during part of 1881 are added to those of Chester for that year, to prevent confusion.

In Table II. the results drawn from the preceding Table are given. The dioceses in this second Table are arranged according to the percentage in each of the confirmed persons. The percentage is calculated on the average of the confirmed in the two years combined of 1880 and 1881, in comparison with the number who arrived in those years at an age to be confirmed.

There are certain facts which are prominently brought out in the second Table. It is noticeable that not one of the

lioceses whose population exceeds a million rises to a per-entage confirmed of fifty per cent. on those who arrive each 'ear at the age for confirmation. *The largest dioccses, as a ule, present the lowest percentage in those confirmed.* Truro is nly a seeming exception to this rule. That diocese is known o be exceptional in its religious character. The diocese itself ıas only been recently constituted, and the influence of Wesleyanism has in Cornwall been almost paramount. It ıas consequently been called the Paradise of revivalists. It nust therefore be regarded as in no way forming an excep-ion to the above statement. As a factor in our calculation Truro is therefore throughout omitted. On the other hand *he smaller the population of a diocese the larger, as a rule, is he percentage of the confirmed.* To this there are only a few xceptions. The cause of these exceptions is easy of explana-ion. They are to be accounted for by the small number of onfirmations held in those exceptional dioceses. It is also oticeable that the number of confirmations held, and there-ore the number of centres of confirmation, influences the ercentage throughout the dioceses. To give a few instances nly: the dioceses of Salisbury and Bath and Wells do not ery materially differ in population, nor in the characteristics f their respective dioceses. They are both almost purely gricultural. The former diocese has a population of 383,000, he latter one of 430,000. The former has seventy-seven onfirmations, the latter only forty. Salisbury has a confirma-ion in one in every six of its churches, and one in every ;,000 of its population; Bath and Wells only one in every welve of its churches, and one in every 10,000 of its popula-ion. The result is that 30 per cent. more are confirmed in he diocese of Salisbury than in that of Bath and Wells.

Gloucester and Bristol and Bath and Wells are contiguous dioceses. The former, with a population 200,000 in excess of Bath and Wells, has the same percentage as that diocese. This result is obtained, in spite of its much larger population, by the former bishop holding sixty-nine confirmations against the forty of Bath and Wells.

Lichfield also, though one of the larger dioceses, has raised its percentage above all of its own size and above several of a much smaller population, and populations far more favourable to the Church, by especial efforts in multi-plying the numbers, and so the centres, of its annual confirma-tions. With its much larger population it is yet 10 per cent. higher than York. This fact is solely attributable to the increased number of confirmations. On the other hand the

very low position of Norwich may be attributed to the fewness of its confirmations. It has an exceedingly low percentage for a purely agricultural diocese; a diocese which is free from the large, overgrown, unmanageable parishes, and from the migratory parishioners, of colliery districts. The fact of there being only one confirmation annually in every twenty-one of the churches of that diocese, and in every 15,000 of its population, and that in a diocese where the 15,000 must be spread over a very considerable area, sufficiently accounts for its holding the lowest position among the purely agricultural dioceses.

Salisbury, which heads all the dioceses by 16 per cent., has also the greatest number of confirmations in proportion to its population. This cause influences the position of almost all the dioceses. Exeter is the only diocese that to any extent seems to contradict this position. The much lower position of this diocese than might have been expected from the great diligence of its bishop in holding confirmations is no doubt attributable to the same cause which, as explained above, gives so low a position to the neighbouring diocese of Truro. Even the present position which Exeter holds results from its standing third in the number of annual confirmations. We can imagine how low its percentage would have been if it had had, like Norwich, only one confirmation in every twenty-one of its churches and one in every 15,000 of its population, or even had it been, like York, one confirmation in every 22,500 of its population and one in every eleven of its churches.

But the influence of multiplied centres can be further illustrated by the following tabulation of seven of the chief agricultural dioceses. It will be seen from it that they take their position as to their percentage of confirmed persons *in an inverse ratio to the area which is embraced in each confirmation. The larger the area the lower the percentage; the smaller the area—the more parochial, in fact, the confirmations are made—the higher as a rule is the diocese upon the list.* Dioceses like Carlisle, which have extensive ranges of moorland, are not included in the table. In the case of Salisbury and Oxford in the following table, where there seems a reversion of the order we might expect, as Salisbury precedes Oxford though covering a larger area at each confirmation, we see that this is explained by Table II., where Salisbury is shown to hold a confirmation in every 4,980 of its population, and Oxford only one in every 6,278.

TABLE III.

Percentage	Diocese	One Confirmation in every — Square Miles
87	Salisbury	26
71	Oxford	24
68	Hereford	32
57	Bath and Wells	40
54	Peterborough	42
45	Lincoln	43
38	Norwich	72

The enormous area covered by each confirmation in the diocese of Norwich may be judged of by the following comparison. The little county of Rutland contains 150 square miles. If a line were drawn north and south cutting the county into two equal divisions, each division would give a very correct representation of each confirmation district in the diocese of Norwich.

What a change as to the number of the confirmed would come over the diocese of Norwich if the same number of confirmations were held in it as in Exeter or as in Lichfield. There is no internal reason why Norwich should not hold as high a position as Gloucester and Bristol at least. The population of the two dioceses is the same. Yet Gloucester and Bristol confirms 57 per cent., Norwich only 38. And in like manner there is no internal reason why York, with a population of 300,000 less than Lichfield, should not be as many stages above Lichfield as Lichfield is now above York, if only York had, like Lichfield, its 138 confirmations annually instead of its 47.

The influence of population and the number of confirmations in proportion thereto may be also strikingly illustrated from the following tabulation. In Table IV. (p. 162) the six dioceses at the head of the percentage in Table II. and the six lowest in it are massed in two classes, and the results are notified below the table.

The percentage given of those confirmed in the *larger* dioceses is in excess of the reality. These larger dioceses are either manufacturing or suburban. They have all largely increased in population between 1871 and 1880–1. The entire increase in England as given in the census of 1881 beyond that of 1871 is 3,000,000. Yorkshire alone, which is embraced by the dioceses of York and Ripon, has increased

440,000. In consequence the percentage given for these and similar dioceses is far too favourable. This refers more or less to all the dioceses which exceed a million in population.

TABLE IV.

	Percentage	Diocese	Population, 1871	Number of Confirmations held	One Confirmation in every
Class A	87	Salisbury	383,514	77	4,980
	71	Oxford	552,770	88	6,278
	68	Hereford	237,138	47	5,045
	65	Chichester	416,328	48	8,670
	59	Canterbury	567,091	89	6,371
	57	Gloucester and Bristol	637,028	69	9,232
Class B	35	Chester	1,762,201	81	21,755
	35	Manchester	1,893,542	65	29,131
	34	London	2,539,000	109	23,293
	33	Rochester	1,500,000	72	20,833
	32	Ripon	1,357,000	54	25,129
	28	Durham	1,077,569	41	26,000

In A 418 confirmations are held in a population of 2,791,869.
In B 422 confirmations are held in a population of 10,129,312.
In A one confirmation in every 6,683 persons.
In B one confirmation in every 24,000 persons.
Consequently in Class A 68 per cent. are confirmed.
Consequently in Class B 33 per cent. are confirmed.

But the very favourable influence of smaller dioceses and increased numbers of confirmations on the work of the Church may be very remarkably instanced from the two dioceses which have now been divided for a few years, and so afford a means of comparison before and after the division. The two dioceses are Rochester and Exeter.

In Rochester before Division	No. of Confirmations	No. Confirmed
1874	60	6,029
1875	93	9,220
1876	82	7,406
	235	22,655

The dioceses were officially separated on May 4, 1877.

Since Division	No. of Confirmations	No. Confirmed
Rochester 1879 .	64	7,244
„ 1880 .	70	8,780
„ 1881 .	65	9,406
	199	25,430
S. Albans 1879 .	62	5,999
„ 1880 .	62	5,462
„ 1881 .	63	7,562
	187	19,023

Before division 22,655
Since „ 44,463

The confirmed are exactly doubled.
The same may be illustrated from Exeter.

	No. of Confirmations	No. Confirmed
Before Division		
Exeter 1875 . .	124	5,401
„ 1876 . .	124	6,274 = 11,675
After Division		
Exeter 1879 . .	106	5,898
„ 1880 . .	102	6,034 = 11,932
Truro 1879 . .	45	1,741
„ 1880 . .	48	1,536 = 3,277

Exeter advances in number, and there is added the clear
in of Truro. Another feature is also noticeable: that
ater results are attained in a smaller area even with fewer
nfirmations than in a more extended area with more con-
nations. In Rochester as divided there are, as above,
430 confirmed with 199 confirmations, against 22,655 with
5 confirmations under its old more extended area. The
ne is noticeable in the case of Exeter. Before division
675 were confirmed, with 248 confirmations; after division
932 were confirmed, with 208 confirmations. The results,
feel sure, would have been still more striking, if the
nbers of confirmations held in Rochester and Exeter
er division had been equal to those before it.

All the preceding percentages are calculated in reference
y to those who each year arrive at the age of fifteen; but
addition to those who are each year arriving at that age
re remains a vast residuum to be gathered up from those

who are past fifteen years of age, and who during all the past years have never been confirmed.

The above statistics show a very serious deficiency in the work of the Church.[1] The question necessarily arises, To what cause can this deficiency be attributed? Though there are many causes which doubtless contribute to this result yet it is felt almost universally that *one of the chief causes lies in defective administration of the rite of confirmation.* Unless a very great change is made in this respect no great improvement can be anticipated.

In order to estimate the position aright take an analogous case. Imagine the effect if we had in the Church wholesale baptisms and wholesale administrations of the Holy Communion annually or triennially. The numbers of the baptized and of the communicants would in every parish become immediately startlingly reduced. Much more would they decline if at these annual or triennial administrations the candidates had to travel several miles to receive baptism or Communion. Infinitely greater still would be the reduction if, in addition to this, these administrations were held solely upon a week day.

If the Church were efficiently supplied with bishops we feel sure that Sunday confirmations would soon become the rule. The week-day confirmations would be the exceptions. It would be as exceptional to hold a confirmation service on the week day as it is now, at least in country parishes, to hold a baptismal service on a week day. At least ninety per cent. of our people are baptized on a Sunday. Sunday is the special day set apart for all other religious ordinances. Sunday is at least pre-eminently the working man's day of possible leisure for such services. In the manufacturing and mining districts, where the number of confirmed persons is fewest, mill hands, whether young men or women, and young men engaged in collieries, are often distinctly refused permission by their overlookers to absent themselves from their work on such occasions. The absence of a few either at a mill or a colliery, or wherever the work is carried on in companies, disorganizes the work at the mill or pit. In fact the

[1] In the above lists the candidates are supposed to be of all ages from fifteen years and upwards. The Bishop of Lichfield, in his recently issued pastoral letter (1883), looking at the results of the confirmations in his diocese, says: 'The numbers, moreover, were greatly swollen by adults, which made even more striking the deficiency as regards the young. It was evident that they were lost by hundreds, and even by thousands, who either drifted into the ranks of dissent, or went to swell the awful multitude living without God or hope in the world.'

masters, if written to, will frequently reply that they cannot throw other hands out of employment and stop the machinery for the accommodation of a few. This power of refusal, which one must admit has its reasonable side, is sometimes exercised with a harsh severity by an irreligious or partisan principal or overlooker. Under the present difficulties of week-day confirmations even *evening* confirmations would be a very great gain. They would enable many to attend who at the present time are debarred from confirmation in the morning and afternoon. A very scathing and severe ordeal would also be saved the younger candidates, such as mill-hands from the factories and colliery lads from the pit, if they had no such ordeal to pass through as to appear during the work-day hours of a week day at confirmation. Few are aware but those who have heard it from the candidates who have gone through it what taunts and gibes are cast at them and what persecution they have to endure. Indeed, it requires no ordinary courage to face it. With very many the trial proves too great, and those who would otherwise have been confirmed are led astray and unite themselves with the scoffers.

Evening confirmations would free numbers of candidates from a persecution against which the Church should endeavour to protect her members. Only let a bishop in such a diocese begin such a system of administration, and the roll of confirmation candidates would in a few years show a marked improvement. The disproportion also between the numbers of male and female candidates would, we feel sure, be greatly reduced. In the confirmations of 1880 170,000 were confirmed. Of these 69,000 were males, and 101,000 females; that is, in the proportion of seven males to ten females.[1]

Without discussing the question of Sunday confirmation in detail we are unable to see why every parish within a radius of twelve miles from the palace should not have its Sunday confirmation. Such annual services in parish churches would form a most wholesome change. The bishop would soon become personally known to a portion at least of his people. His annual visit would be looked forward to, and in many cases eagerly anticipated, until in time the 'Bishop's Sunday' might become a loving household word in every

[1] According to the *Official Year-Book* (p. 600), the total number of confirmed persons (not including Exeter and Llandaff) for ten years in England and Wales was 584,731 males, 886,987 females; that is, about 6 to 9. This shows on the ten years a very similar proportion between males and females to the results at which we had independently arrived.

home of the parish, and thus the old pastoral ideal of the father of his people might be realized by any bishop who would value so simple and primitive a title. Such confirmations would be strictly parochial. A few words earnestly spoken to the young on such occasions in the quiet of their own church, while they are surrounded by their parents and friends, would leave an impression never to be forgotten. It would reach also the older members of the congregation. Such an annual visit of the bishop to his people, even in a radius of twelve miles from the palace, would have a real and living influence. The Church might then hope that her annals would tell the pleasant story of many a Bishop Wilson, whose personal and kindly pastorate had been exercised in her smaller dioceses. One cannot help noticing in this connection how small [1] was the diocese over which the Bishop of Sodor and Man obtained that strong, firm, beneficent, and personal influence which has made his name so venerated in our Church.

The large numbers presented at a confirmation also act most injuriously on the devotional spirit of the congregation. Over 500 candidates are in many instances presented at a time. Even the average at each confirmation of Manchester is 184; this is the highest diocesan average. If the average of the diocese of Manchester is so high, what must the number at some of its confirmations reach? The archdiocese of York is the next highest average; its average is 151. Large numbers of candidates must surely tend to extinguish a quiet devotional spirit. How can the 'prayers of the Church' be a reality if the administration is reduced to a wearisome and formal repetition?

If every parish were permitted to have a Sunday confirmation annually the rite of confirmation would be brought home with great force. Parishioners who had in former years brought their children to be baptized at the font would witness the sealing of the baptized by confirmation in the same church. The two rites would soon be very closely associated in the minds of the people. The one would be considered incomplete without the other. The administration of the two rites in the same church would appeal strongly to those parents whose happiest and earliest religious associations were, according to the ideal of the Church of England, connected with their own parish church. It would, in the course of a generation, be-

[1] The present population of Sodor and Man is 51,000, the benefices number 31, and the area is 226 square miles. The area of the diocese is only one-fourth larger than Rutlandshire.

e as unusual to omit the confirmation of their children as now unusual to omit their baptism.

We must decline to agree with the Bishop of Rochester, in a recent charge has sought a remedy for existing by discouraging the parochial feeling. The Bishop ewhat humorously observes, 'Our numbers of confirmed ons for this year (1881) are already 8,022; they will be o before the end of the year. But our numbers should 8,000, a total which for one person's physical strength ıt be a severe though exhilarating trial.' His Lordship t pardon us for adding the correction that 27,000, not oo, ought to present themselves for confirmation, if the e population arriving at the age of fifteen years in diocese annually is reckoned. To relieve this strain the op asks his clergy 'to discountenance the growing habit eferring confirmation till they receive it at their own ch. Many slip,' says the Bishop, 'through the delay, who rwise would have attained it. It is not quite fair upon bishop.' Whilst heartily agreeing that any enforced ıilaration' would be scarcely fair upon his Lordship, might ot ask, Is not 'fairness' also to be considered in reference ıose who are the other parties to the rite?

But in addition to this one branch of episcopal duties e are many other reasons which necessitate an increase ıe episcopacy if the Church of England is in any way to l her mission as an episcopal Church. There is need of uch closer and more intimate relation and acquaintance veen the bishop and the clergy as well as the people of diocese. We all know that bishops with their work half e are yet greatly overtaxed. The late Bishop (Selwyn) of ıfield had two assistant-bishops, and yet the Bishop of :oln writes of him 'that nevertheless he sank beneath the ht of the pressure of his enormous diocese. He fell a tyr to his episcopal office.'[1]

Not only are the dioceses enormous, but the duties of the copacy are so multifarious that the episcopacy, as far as *piritual* power goes, is almost unfelt by the clergy and people. Our Church claims to be an episcopal Church. should use every means to make the episcopacy a reality, al, personal, spiritual power and influence 'known and of all men.' It is no singular experience for a clergy- to be in the diocese of a bishop twenty or thirty years,

[1] During the last five years of Bishop Selwyn's episcopate (1873-77), verage number annually of confirmations held in his diocese was 212; ighest reaching 219, the lowest 204.

and his only acquaintance with his diocesan has probably been a semi-public interview at a confirmation, or at the consecration of a church or churchyard. As the ideal parish clergyman is to his people so ought the ideal bishop to be to his clergy, a real father in Christ. Ought we in this nineteenth century wholly to lose sight of the New Testament ideal of the relation of a bishop and his clergy pourtrayed in the loving picture of the relations between Paul and Timothy? We do not imply by this question that such real and sympathizing relations have entirely ceased to exist, but only that, owing to the great extent of the dioceses, it is impossible that such a relation should *generally* prevail.

It might be asked, To what numbers in population should a diocese be limited? We think that most of the clergy would reply that a diocese *in no case* ought to exceed a population of 250,000, unless when massed in a single town.

It seems to us that a population of 250,000 souls is large enough, even when the population is only moderately spread, if the episcopate is to be really effective. Where the population is spread over a large area, as in York, Lincoln, and Oxford, or similar dioceses, even a quarter of a million seems excessive. Only half the year is available for general confirmation. With a population of 250,000 there would be annually arriving at confirmation age 4,500. If only 3,000 represented the population belonging to the Church it would give 120 as the number to be confirmed each week. If the residuum of past years were added to this it would give at least 180 a week. This number, if the bishop were to visit all his churches annually, so as to make his confirmations *personal* and *parochial*, would be as many as a bishop, confining himself to evening and Sunday confirmations, would be able, taking into consideration his other duties, weekly to confirm.

In reference to any extension of the episcopate the difficult question of funds immediately arises. This difficulty of course only arises on the supposition that the episcopate must be extended on the lines of our present mediæval system. It would be well if all these conditions could be utterly set aside, at least in all schemes touching upon the extension of the episcopate. The New Testament commission of Christ would then more prominently occupy our thoughts. Thousands of good Church people are so blindly prejudiced in favour of our present system that they imagine that a bishop could not befittingly exercise his spiritual office unless he were a peer of Parliament, or that the spiritual office of a bishop could not be fulfilled on less

than 3,000*l.* or 4,000*l.* a year. The conception of these faithful souls reminds us of the anecdote which is told us of S. Thomas of Aquinum, the 'Angel of the Schools,' as he was called. Aquinas was one day sitting in the Vatican with Pope Innocent IV. when masses of gold and silver were being carried into the Papal treasury. 'You see,' said the Pope with a touch of self-satisfaction, 'the age of the Church is passed when she could say, "Silver and gold have I none."' 'Yes, Holy Father,' replied the Angelic Doctor, 'the day is also passed when she could say to the paralytic, "Take up thy bed and walk."'

It has been abundantly manifested in the last five years that the extension of the episcopate by means of the creation of wealthy bishoprics, in contrast to the miserably poor livings of the clergy, does not meet with the hearty sympathy of the laity. The Act of 1878 was very limited in its application. It applied only to the creation of four new bishoprics. These new sees were made conditional on a capital sum of at least 90,000*l.* being actually subscribed. The four proposed bishoprics were Liverpool, Newcastle, Wakefield, and Southwell. Yet after more than five years' diligent canvassing this sum has only been raised for the first two dioceses mentioned. The subscriptions for one of these—namely, Newcastle—were largely supplemented by the diversion of endowment from the mother see of Durham. There still remain difficulties—we do not say insurmountable ones by any means—in raising the required sum for the other two. These difficulties will, however, we fear, continue too long, unless wealthy individuals contribute, as Lady Rolle did in the endowment of the Cornish bishopric, the larger portion out of their own private beneficence from some special interest in the locality. The sum required does not commend itself as of an apostolic pattern, and is far too exorbitant to enlist the interest of the general public, and so has failed to meet with an immediate and cordial response.

Under these circumstances it would be a fatal error to endeavour to perpetuate the creation of bishoprics on our present lines. Neither the position as peers of the realm nor the income of the present bishops is a necessary standard for the creation of new bishoprics, which may possibly be equally efficient as a *spiritual* power on a more primitive and apostolic basis. Dean Hook, in a letter given in his recently published Life, says, 'I do not see why our bishops should not be as poor as Ambrose and Augustine, that they may make the people really rich.' Bishop Jolly wrote before his death

to the Bishop of Moray, 'Our episcopacy (the Scotch) is perfectly the same as that of England, but happily (shall I say) divested of all temporal honours.' The late Bishop of Brechin, writing of the personal influence of Bishop Jolly, says, 'The life and teaching and work of that man, quiet, hidden, and humble as it was, is producing great results. Instead of four bishops we have now seven in Scotland, and the feeling of the people towards the Church is undergoing a great change.'

In contrast to the Restrictive Act of 1878 there exists the system of free development of new parishes, as enacted by the Peel and Blandford Acts. By the former of these Acts, passed in 1843, a district could be formed when an endowment was provided for the minister of the annual value of 100*l.*: and if less than 150*l.* it was to be raised to the latter value upon the district becoming a new parish. When the above endowment was provided the new district was constituted. The endowment did not, at the utmost, represent more than a capital sum of 4,000*l.* The necessity even of this small endowment being provided was set aside by Lord Blandford's Act in 1846. The third section of that Act gives the Ecclesiastical Commissioners the discretion of forming a new district, without having the aforesaid endowment absolutely provided beforehand, 'if there is reason to expect from other sources an adequate maintenance for the incumbent.'

No one could doubt that the income of the inferior clergy provided by the Commissioners is sufficiently apostolic in its sparseness. An income of 150*l.* a year, and that not in every case previously guaranteed, is considered an 'adequate maintenance' for a clergyman and his family! Perhaps even the most ardent enthusiast for an *episcopate* extended also on simple and apostolic lines could scarcely wish for an Act for the extension of the episcopacy equally merciless in its economy. Yet provision might be made for the 'adequate maintenance' of the new bishops, which would be sumptuous indeed, even at a minimum of, say, 750*l.* or 800*l.* per annum, compared with the minimum of 150*l.* per annum which the Commissioners have judged an 'adequate maintenance' for the *συμπρεσβύτεροι* of the clergy.

By the Peel and Blandford Acts a free development of parishes was established to meet the spiritual needs of the people, whatever may be said of their adequacy to meet the temporal needs of the clergy. During the last seventy-five years 3,399 entirely new district churches have been built, and of these about 2,600 in the last thirty-six years under the

operation of these Acts. An episcopal Church necessarily requires for its efficiency a corresponding freedom in the multiplication of bishops.[1]

Some of the greatest evils in the Church have resulted from the violent contrast existing between the position and incomes of the bishops and the clergy of the Church. It has isolated the bishops and removed them from the clergy. The present Archbishop of Canterbury, quoted by Sir William Worsley at the York Conference (1880), speaks of the the *solitariness* and *isolation* of bishops.

'The primitive view of the strength of bishops,' he says, 'was not solitariness; but we, whether the causes are social, or whether it is due to some unconscious imitation, have been reproducing in our episcopate nearly that isolation which Rome has effected for her bishops, with the deliberate aim in her case that she obliged them to turn to the Vatican for support.'

A gulf such as that which exists between the bishops and the clergy should not exist in any Church of Christ. Such a disproportion exists in no secular avocation, whether official or professional. It is not found in the different ranks of either of army or navy. In the law it is often at a great sacrifice of income that the leading barrister accepts his promotion to the judgeship. This is the case in all secular official life and in all Government offices. In the American Episcopal Church the income of an able and eminent clergyman in the larger towns, as New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago, often very considerably exceeds the income given to the bishops.

This gulf between the bishops and clergy has in later years been tending to widen rather than to diminish. The incomes of very many of the larger livings of the inferior clergy have been divided. In some cases, as in the noble instance of Dean Hook at Leeds, the income of the incum-

[1] We conceive that a very grave and fundamental error was committed by the committee of the Additional Home Bishoprics Endowment Fund when they came to the decision as expressed in their report. In fact this decision produced the Act of 1878.

'In approaching the subject submitted to them your committee had first to consider whether they ought to face an increase of an extensive character, involving a notable alteration in the existing and long-recognized status of the English episcopate, or only a moderate addition of bishops in parts of the country where the sees were, by reason of area or of the growth of the population, manifestly too few for the actual condition of the Church, the new bishops being, as far as possible, to be placed on the same footing as the existing bishops. The committee unanimously resolved to approach the question from the latter point of view.' (Vide *Official Year-Book*, p. 304.)

bent has been at his own suggestion divided, in order to carry out the work of the Church more efficiently. Old parish churches have also in many instances lost much of their income by the necessary diversion of fees to the new district churches. Together with these changes other causes are now operating extensively in bringing about the same result. At the diocesan conference held in Ely (July 1881) the Bishop of Ely said—

'The incomes of the clergy of this diocese are almost exclusively associated with land. I regret to say that benefices have been vacated from the impossibility of continuing to hold them, and are still without incumbents, because there is little or no income accruing from them, the glebe being unlet and lying perfectly unproductive.'

The same complaint is heard from every agricultural diocese.

The same severance exists between bishop and people. The two are never brought into contact except on some special occasion. The episcopacy has no hold whatever upon the masses. Let us not be deceived by a casual 'ovation' on any great occasion, as at a Working Men's Meeting at our Church Congresses, or as at some factory address during a special mission. The bishops are unknown to the working men in the large manufacturing towns. 'It does not do,' as Dr. Arnold said fifty years ago, 'to speak to our operatives in these days about our pure and apostolical Church.' The power of the Church would be infinitely extended and established if the bishops were not so far removed from contact with the mass of the population. The bishops have been compelled, from sheer necessity, to abandon to others, except on very special occasions, the work of making known Christ's message to the indifferent, the outcast, and the depraved. There is needed, if the episcopacy remain as it is, some connecting link between the bishop and the people. If such a link is not found we cannot expect that a democracy towards which, by household suffrage and other imminent changes, we are more and more tending will care to preserve a form of episcopacy of which it knows nothing, and between which and itself there are no cords of sympathy. During the last fifteen years nothing has been more remarkable than the violent changes of popular opinion. In 1868 Mr. Gladstone came into power with an overwhelming majority. In 1874 he was thrown out with an equally overwhelming adverse vote. In 1880 a still more astonishing majority again returned Mr. Gladstone to power. So great and widespread was the change that the Duke of Argyll, in

his speech against the Irish Land Bill, said that the Government was lately installed in power by one of the greatest and most violent revolutions of public opinion which has ever taken place in the political history of the country. Such oscillations can scarcely be considered as the result of settled convictions. They have been attributed merely to a momentary superiority in organization, and it has been asserted 'that they have nothing to do with what is Conservative or Liberal, much less with what is right or wrong, truth or falsehood.' With these changes of popular opinion there is also combined another feature of the present age, which has been described by the late Dr. Norman Macleod 'as a jealousy of all monopolies, of all institutions, of all privileges, which secure good to the few at the expense, directly or indirectly, of the many.' No thoughtful person can regard the present relation of the episcopate to the people without some feeling of dismay, especially if there is no effectual attempt made by the Church on her part by reformation and adaptation to meet it. Grave and important questions will rise to the surface, as they have risen lately, on the instant, and it will only require some master mind in the State to say 'that they have now come within the range of practical politics.'

This episcopal position and isolation has led to a condition which is fraught with danger to the Church, the *μοναρχία* of the episcopacy, which unfortunately in many cases strangles her development. Such a principle was foreign to the primitive episcopacy. Our bishops, from their secular position, have been able to initiate all laws affecting the Church. Power has consequently for centuries been accumulating in their hands. The priesthood and laity are utterly powerless in any administration of the general affairs of the Church. The bishops alone, and not the Church collectively, are the sole depositaries of power. They too, and not the Church, are the sole founts of honour.

This *μοναρχία* extends to the smallest concerns. The clergy in their assemblies have not even the privilege of electing their own chairman. The chairman of the rural deanery meetings is appointed by the bishop. The only exceptions to this are the dioceses of Exeter and Cornwall: in which the clergy elect their own rural dean, and elect him only for three years. At the end of that time he can be elected for another term. The present Bishop of Lichfield has taken one step in advance in the exercise of the patronage in the bishop's gift. He has associated with himself for the bestowal of his patronage the capitular body of his cathedral.

This, though not likely to be ultimately satisfactory, is yet a hopeful beginning. We should hope that it may ultimately pass to devolving all patronage, as of old, on the representatives of the Church, of the clergy and laity and bishop combined.

The same spirit has likewise retarded the creation of representative assemblies of the Church. The influence of the clergy does not sensibly extend beyond the boundaries of their own parishes. The Church consists of parochial units. The Lower House of Convocation has remained for three centuries unreformed, whilst the counterpart in the secular division of the State—the House of Commons—has been reformed continually to meet the ever-varying necessities of the time. It does not require a prophet to foretell the end. Stagnation in such a state is only another name for destruction. The Lower House of Convocation can scarcely be considered more than a repetition of the Upper House, so entirely does the episcopal nominee element prevail. Self-government, the very instinct of the Anglo-Saxon race, has been lost to the Church. An embodied expression of the voice of the English Church, of the laity and clergy combined, is unknown. Dissenters can express their opinions through organizations embodied in connexion with their opinions. The Congregationalists have their Union. The Wesleyans in their various branches have their Conferences. Through these central organizations their opinions have great weight on all religious questions brought before Parliament. Only very recently diocesan conferences have been called into existence. The bishops, with a few most honourable exceptions, have manifested a lamentable backwardness in allowing these conferences to be purely representative. The conferences are in the majority of cases destroyed as representative assemblies by the preponderance of episcopal nominees. In them an anomaly, rare in any English institution, is presented of life members and elected members sitting side by side, the former independent of public opinion, the latter subject to rejection triennially if they contravene it. Salisbury, Oxford, S. Albans, and the most recently constituted conference of the London diocese, are however almost free from nominees. In these four conferences only the archdeacons among the clerical members sit *ex officio*. Rochester adds the canon residentiary: but for what purpose this addition is made it is impossible to divine. In the Hereford Conference there are forty-three *ex officio* clerical nominees to forty-seven elected representatives. In that of S. David's diocese they

are equally divided. The dean, in addition to the bishop, should alone of the clerical members of a diocese sit *ex officio*. He is appointed independently of the bishop to the diocese. He is at the head of the cathedral chapter, and might well act as vice-chairman of the conference. The great disadvantage of the introduction of the episcopal nominee element is felt in the diocesan conferences themselves, from its preventing the real mind of the diocese being made known. It prevents all effectual progress in a diocese. The nominees, as being permanent officials in it, naturally fill and form the standing committees of the conference. They are always at hand. They reappear from year to year, and newly elected men who would bring fresh life and energy into the work are excluded. If the evil stayed here, and were merely diocesan, the consequences would not be so injurious. But unhappily these nominees will most effectually prevent the formation of a distinctly representative Central Council, and so prevent the mind of the Church being made known to the country.[1] This great evil can only be obviated in such a case—*i.e.* if these nominees are to continue—by its being not only understood, but also by its being made one of the standing bye-laws of every conference, that no unelected member of a diocesan conference shall be eligible for election to the Central Council. If such a bye-law is not made universal, or is not made by the Central Council as a necessary qualification to association and election to it, the Central Council will only become a modified Lower House of Convocation, equally unrepresentative, equally unprogressive, and equally impotent.

'Whenever the Church is bold enough to devise means by which the general voice of Churchmen, laity as well as clergy, can speak authoritatively, Parliament will listen to it. That such an assembly is perfectly compatible with Establishment the example of the

[1] To the present Central Council twenty-three dioceses send representatives. Out of sixty-nine clerical members sent to the Central Council only twenty-two are elected by the clergy to their respective diocesan conferences. In fact not one-third are the representatives of the clergy. The following twelve dioceses send all officials, nominees: Canterbury, Winchester, Bath and Wells, Carlisle, Chichester, Ely, Gloucester and Bristol, Manchester, Oxford, Peterborough, S. David's, and Truro. The following five send one elected member each: Hereford (Rev. J. Mitchell), Lichfield (Rev. F. Atkinson), Lincoln (Canon Hole), Ripon (Canon Temple), Rochester (Canon Money). So that seventeen out of the twenty-three dioceses send *five* clerical representatives between them! It is quite impossible that such a council can command the confidence of the clergy, or can be supposed to make known the mind of the Church to the country.

Scotch General Assembly is a sufficient proof. Why should we not acknowledge what is the real need, and, undeterred by gloomy prophecies, move resolutely towards it?'[1]

It is opportune to consider the needful reform of such assemblies, which, from lack of a representative character, can never secure the confidence of the Church, at a time when the Liberation Society is straining every nerve and making every effort to disestablish and disendow the Church. Our present condition too has been, and is, a continual source of *inward* disruption. The great religious revival of fifty years ago sprang from a desire to resuscitate the authority of the Church, to quicken her to a new vitality. If a free scope had been granted, if a full representation had been given, the dangerous tendencies then would have been escaped. The Church has suffered irretrievably from having too morbid a dread of change. In matters of organization to adapt herself to the times is strength and security. The Bishop of Tasmania in 1881 wrote to the public papers saying that in the Colonial churches synods of clergy and laity were the source of their security and unity. The *Guardian*, in reference to the Bishop's letters, wrote (March 9, 1881):—

'We believe that the Bishop of Tasmania is quite right in tracing the want of deference to episcopal authority to the too simply autocratic character which that authority has assumed, and in concluding that the diocesan synod is the great security for diocesan unity and life. The synod, moreover, should be above all suspicion of being composed of "episcopal nominees," and we think the Bishop of Winchester quite right in his assertion that this necessity is already felt and recognized in a considerable degree.'

In order to obviate in a measure the existing isolation between bishops on the one hand and the clergy and people on the other, many are of opinion that all bishoprics of future creation should have no claim, even by rotation, to a seat in the House of Lords. This would also, in a measure, tend to restore our episcopate to a more apostolic and primitive model. The Earl of Devon, at the recent Church Congress at Derby, expressed and urged this view upon the Congress. His Lordship said—

'I am sure that greater facility would be given for the creation of bishoprics if it were provided that only a certain number of bishops—say all the old historical bishoprics antecedent to Henry VIII.—should have seats in the House of Lords. The others would not be called upon to exercise any Parliamentary duties, would not be obliged

[1] *Guardian*, January 19, 1881.

to live in London, and consequently would be able to maintain themselves on a smaller income than a bishop at present needs. One objection that is not unnaturally raised to the multiplication of bishops—namely, that it would be impossible to introduce a large number into the House of Lords—would by this means be removed.'

There are three forms under which the deficiencies of the episcopate could be supplied: by independent, by suffragan, and by assistant, bishops. There can be but little doubt that the only real effectual remedy for our present distress is the division ultimately of our present dioceses and the creation of independent sees. We do not, however, think that the time is yet fully come to form such independent sees directly, but rather that approach must be made to them indirectly through the previous appointment of suffragans.

One point which should always be most carefully considered is the selection of the town from which the suffragan is to take his title, and in or near which his place of residence is to be established. It is most desirable as the episcopacy increases that the dioceses (except in the division of the large counties) should be made conterminous with counties. The county divisions regulate to a very great extent all the political, social, and judicial arrangements. The county town, with but few exceptions, should be made the city of the bishop's title and residence. In this light we cannot but regard the selection of Southwell as the seat of the new bishopric which is to embrace the county of Nottingham as an unfortunate mistake. It is selected from the mere fact that there is there a noble collegiate church of cathedral dimensions, with other buildings suitable for a chapter. The mere fact of a large and magnificent church and other old associations connected with Southwell should not have been allowed to outweigh other far more important considerations. Southwell stands on a branch line of railway merely. It is consequently comparatively difficult of access. On the other hand, Nottingham is the county town, and a very important county town. It has a population of 186,000, Southwell only a population of 11,000.[1] There can be but little doubt

[1] This selection of Southwell has been made in spite of the decision of the committee for the increase of the episcopate. That committee, after weighing the claims of the two towns, decide, 'On the whole the committee recommend that Nottingham should be the see town.' A similar mistake has most happily been avoided in the new diocese of Northumberland. 'The Cathedral Commission, in its report of 1855, recommended the grand old minster of Hexham to be constituted the cathedral. Considering, however, the comparative insignificance of the town of Hexham, the committee *have no hesitation* in recommending that

also that before long the county of Derby, now included in the contemplated Southwell diocese, will acquire a bishop of its own. In all future creations of suffragans the idea of their becoming bishops of separated dioceses should always be the prominent consideration. We should thus be developing our episcopate from below upwards, exactly on the precedent, as Dean Bickersteth suggested, of the Peel and Blandford districts, where the minister ultimately becomes the incumbent of a separated parish.

In the following Tables we have ventured to indicate the dioceses in which suffragans seem to be immediately and urgently needed for the efficient administration of the Church. Where the old dioceses have consisted of two or more counties the divided dioceses are made conterminous with county boundaries. Where the counties are themselves divided the present political divisions of such counties are followed, except in the case of Lincolnshire. Among the suggested sees there are ten—those printed in italics—which are already mentioned in the Suffragan Act of Henry VIII. For the establishment of these ten nothing further is needed than for the Church to get that Act put in force. The names of the sixteen remaining towns mentioned in that Act are the following: Thetford, Taunton, Bridgwater, Nottingham, Shaftesbury, Molton, Marlborough, Bristow, Penrith, Huntington, Cambridge, Pereth, Berwick, S. Germains, and Isle of Wight. Dover, to which a suffragan was appointed by the late Archbishop, is also one of the towns mentioned in the Act. It is not likely in these times that any of these, excepting the first four, are at any time likely to become episcopal sees. The Act, as it at present stands, does not give the Church the development which is now necessary to it. It is in the Northern and Midland counties more particularly, exclusive of the metropolitan or home counties, that the greatest deficiency is felt. Only two of the towns mentioned in the Act are north of the Humber—Hull and Berwick. To adapt an analogous Act to the present needs of the Church it would be necessary to incorporate into it the names of many towns which have risen into importance and position during the last 300 years. Or, still better, any Act relating to suffragans should allow, as in the case of new parishes, the establishment of a suffragan wherever the necessities of the Church indicate the need, and wherever an en-

the large, growing, and very important county town of Newcastle should be the see town, and its noble Church of S. Nicholas the cathedral.' (*Official Year-Book of the Church*, p. 304.)

Census (1881) of Old D.	Old Diocese	Jurisdiction retained	Population retained	Jurisdiction of New Diocese	Episcopal Town	Population of New D.	Remarks
640,000	Canterbury	East Kent	303,113	West Kent	Greenwich (?)	337,000	
1,600,000	Rochester	Mid ,,	285,060	West Surrey	*Guildford*	1,435,842	W. Surrey taken from diocese of Winchester
				Mid ,,	Kingston		
				East ,,	Croydon		
1,300,000	Winchester	Hampshire	460,000	Southampton, I. of W., Chan. Isls.	*Southampton*	224,368	Giving up West Surrey
519,286	Ely	Cambridgeshire	186,363	Bedfordshire & Huntingdonshire	*Bedford*	200,075	Ely giving up to Ipswich its Suffolk parishes
601,374	Exeter	N. and E. Devon	354,886	South Devon	Plymouth	246,511	
700,000	Gloucester	E. Gloucestershire	250,000	West Gloucestershire	*Bristol*	384,012	Giving up two deaneries in Somerset to Wells, and two in Wilts to Salisbury
1,060,000	Lichfield	East Stafford	345,135	Shropshire	*Shrewsbury*	247,993	Part of Shropshire is now in Hereford. Present population of Lichfield 1,520,000. Derby and Nottingham are deducted for Southwell. Monmouth should be added to Hereford from large diocese of Llandaff
				North Staffordshire	Stoke	302,597	
				South ,,	Stafford	269,944	
469,994	Lincoln	N. Lincolnshire	250,000	South Lincolnshire	*Grantham*	220,000	
1,930,000	Manchester	Manchester and Salford	580,000		Lancaster	1,340,000	
					Blackburn		
					Bolton		
					Oldham		
668,123	Norwich	Norfolk	444,000	Suffolk	*Ipswich*	356,863	Suffolk would take part of present diocese of Ely
574,309	Oxford	Oxfordshire	176,650	Berkshire	Reading	218,382	
				Buckinghamshire	Aylesbury	176,277	
617,976	Peterboro'	Northamptonshire	272,524	Leicestershire and Rutland	*Leicester*	343,452	
800,000	St. Albans	Hertfordshire	202,990	Essex	*Colchester*	575,571	Colchester has in a measure been established
					Chelmsford		
1,200,000	Worcester	Worcestershire	380,291	Warwickshire	Coventry	337,188	
					Birmingham	400,000	

dowment of modest yet sufficient amount renders the permanency of the see adequately secure.

Every diocese, except that of Lincoln, suggested for division in the above Table has a population exceeding 500,000. Lincoln is, however, added, as its population reaches 470,000, and it has also the enormous area, even after Nottinghamshire under Southwell is withdrawn from it, of 2,776 square miles. Episcopal supervision in such a case cannot possibly be anything more than nominal.

In the above Table we have omitted all reference to the dioceses of York, Ripon, and London. The county of York, comprising within itself the two former dioceses, requires urgently five new bishoprics. There can be no doubt that Leeds, Bradford, Sheffield, and Hull, as well as Wakefield, have each pressing claims for a bishop of their own. The former is not only the chief town in the Eastern Division of the West Riding, but it is also the chief town of the county as far as a commercial centre is concerned, and has a population of over 300,000. Bradford is also the chief and leading town in the Northern Division of the West Riding, and this division alone has a population of 555,000. The above five new bishoprics, as a minimum, are required to render the episcopate for the county in any way efficient. The area of the county is 5,980, or nearly 6,000, square miles, or more than double the area of Lincolnshire. It has within its limits a population of 2,880,466, or nearly 3,000,000. To these facts of extent and population, there must be added a third—the rapid increase of population in the county in each decennial period. From 1871 to 1881 the population increased by 444,226. The present political divisions of the county into North, East, and West Ridings, and the latter again into its three political districts of Eastern, Northern, and Western, would without much difficulty, and with only a little adaptation in reference to Ripon, form a basis for the creation and localization of such bishoprics. To each of the seven bishoprics which would then exist in the county, a large and important population—a population which will have a very material influence in moulding the prospects of the Church in the future—would be attached. With seven bishoprics the smallest diocese in the county would still exceed 300,000 in population.

The sum required for the five new bishoprics, if the minimum endowment above spoken of were adopted, would scarcely exceed the endowment which is now required for the single bishopric of Wakefield. We are convinced that there would be less difficulty in raising an endowment to the

amount suggested for the five new dioceses than is now experienced in raising it for the one. The subscriptions promised for the Wakefield bishopric already amount to a sum which would competently endow the see, if established upon the lines advocated by the Earl of Devon. Let such an Act be passed that the other four bishoprics should be definitely proposed for creation in such towns as Leeds, Sheffield, Bradford, and Hull, and few who know those towns would doubt of a very ready and immediate response. Such northern towns are very willing to remedy any acknowledged deficiency in the work or ministry of the Church, provided that the scheme commends itself as needful, as reasonable, and as practical. Whatever may be the politics of Churchmen in the North, there is, we believe, an earnest wish and willingness among all her members that the Church should be able efficiently to fulfil her Divine mission. Any reluctance to promote the establishment of such new bishoprics will not be on the part of the laity.

North Riding	York	407,579	
East Riding	*Hull*	302,970	
West Riding, Eastern Division . .	Ripon (N.) [1]	640,558	
" " " " . .	Leeds (S.)		
" " Northern Division .	Bradford	555,000	
" " Southern Division .	Wakefield (N.)	973,359	
" " " " . .	Sheffield (S.)		

In the case of London the population is in round numbers ,000,000. Ten suffragan bishops would not more than suffice or so vast a diocese. They should, however, stand to the ishop of London in a different relation from all other suffragans. They should not, we think, at least at first, become ishops of independent sees. Unity wit'ı efficiency would ıus be preserved in the metropolis.

Other dioceses, which yet would allow of being divided ost beneficially for the cause and work of the Church, are ot referred to in the above Tables, as they fall below 500,000 population, and the most glaring deficiencies are those dicated. Among these we might especially mention the iocese of Chichester, which comprises the entire county of ussex. The parliamentary districts of East and West ussex, with Lewes as the see town of the former, as

[1] The adaptation spoken of above would be that the bishopric of Ripon should retain that portion of the North Riding which it has at the present time, and also the northern sections of the Northern and Eastern Divisions of the West Riding.

Chichester is of the latter, would form large and compact dioceses. If the deaneries in Wiltshire now under Gloucester and Bristol were made over to the diocese of Salisbury, it is probable that the Bishop of Salisbury might be willing or even desirous to part with Dorsetshire, and that the name, though not the place, of one of the most ancient of the English sees—Dorchester—might be restored. The population of Wiltshire exceeds 250,000. In like manner, the double-titled see of Bath and Wells would for the work of the Church be most advantageously divided, Wells retaining Mid and West Somerset with a population of 248,890, and Bath the eastern or remaining division of the county.

In addition to the suffragans as above, in certain special dioceses and in certain special cases, as when the advanced age or infirm health of the bishop of a see renders it necessary, the assistant-bishop, *i.e.* a bishop without any distinct territorial assignment, might, with great advantage to the Church, be more generally called into action. At the present time the Church can only supply assistant-bishops by bishops returned from the colonies. But there ought to be no difficulty in having a measure devised and passed which would allow every bishop, with the consent and approval of his metropolitan, to ordain, if necessary, and appoint one or more such assistant-bishops to assist him under any difficulties or disabilities of health which might arise. The limitation of their duties might be expressed in the words of Archbishop Peckham. He required the Bishop of Lichfield, in consideration of his infirmities, to provide a suffragan 'qui circumeat prædicando, ecclesias dedicando, parvulos confirmando, et alia exequendo, quæ ad episcopale officium requiruntur.'

All that is required to establish suffragans is enabling power on the part of the Legislature. This important subject has constantly occupied the attention of both Houses of Convocation. Resolutions have been passed in both Houses of both provinces on the necessity of the increase of the episcopate by the subdivision of sees, and by the revival of Henry VIII.'s Suffragan Act. The present Bishop of Lincoln in 1866, when a member of the Lower House as Archdeacon of Westminster, advocated application to Parliament for a permissive Bill for the subdivision of dioceses. The motion was carried, and presented to the Upper House. The Upper House unanimously agreed with this proposition. A committee of the Upper House was formed to consider the Act of Henry VIII. In the report of that committee it was said, 'We consider it desirable that action should be taken under

the existing Act of Henry VIII., and the report of the committee recommends that an attempt should be made through your Grace to sweep away any difficulties which may have existed in the matter.' No Government without consulting Parliament would sanction the disinterment of an Act which has been in abeyance for 300 years. But why should the bishops delay to consult Parliament, since the present Premier even so long ago as 1850 expressed himself in favour of legislative measures for the augmentation of the number of bishops? Such a scheme, therefore, after having been under the consideration of Mr. Gladstone for over thirty years, ought to be fairly well matured in his own mind; and it would therefore, we would hope, only need some slight impetus given from without to bring it at once into operation. Seeing that an enlarged episcopate is now the urgent and crying need of the Church, why should it be any longer delayed?

We fear that even on the part of the bishops there might arise the common objection that by dividing dioceses the prestige and dignity of ancient sees would be diminished. In more things than one the Church of England is inclined to die of dignity, and like the frog in the fable to expire of excess of self-arrogation.

In answer to this very common objection we would quote the words of the Bishop of Durham in his late visitation Charge.

'When I was working for the division of the diocese,' says the Bishop, 'I was met again and again with the objection—frankly stated, and I doubt not sincerely held—that the dignity and prestige of the ancient see of Durham would suffer irreparably from the change. My constant reply has been that the dignity and prestige of the see existed only for the sake of its efficiency, and that the sacrifice must be made if it were needed. Now that it is made the change must be the subject of unalloyed joy and thankfulness to all that have at heart the well-being and efficiency of the Church of England.'

By thus developing our episcopacy, from below upwards, the ancient form of election might perhaps be restored to the Church. By the Suffragan Act permission was given 'to every archbishop and bishop of the realm and of Wales to name two honest and discreet spiritual persons to his Majesty, and that his Majesty should have full power and authority to give to one of such persons the name of a bishop of such of the sees aforesaid.' Our representative conferences might nominate two such persons to the bishop, and the bishop to the Queen. We might then hope to witness at no distant day in our conferences, diocesan or central, solemn scenes similar to one which has very recently been witnessed in the

Canadian Synod at the election of a missionary bishop for Algoma.

If the question of the extension of the episcopate were a question of the creation of new and independent bishoprics on the mediæval lines, the difficulties, as we have already said, would be great, involving as it would a seat in the House of Lords, a palace, and an income adequate to such position. There would not, however, be any lack of interest or any difficulty in raising sufficient sums for a fitting endowment of suffragan bishops without such expensive accompaniments. If such bishops were created with an endowment of a minimum sum of, say, 750*l.* or 800*l.* a year, we have no doubt that such a sum would be raised in every diocese if the bishop only expressed his desire for such a helper. A remarkable instance of such willingness has very recently been furnished in the diocese of S. Albans. The bishop had expressed his desire for a helper. A private meeting was held by a few of the leading noblemen and gentlemen of the diocese to furnish the funds for a suffragan bishop. It was unanimously determined to raise a sum of not less than 1,000*l.* a year for five years for the stipend of such bishop. Of that amount more than 500*l.* a year was promised in the room. In less than a fortnight the minimum sum was reached, without any public appeal whatever.

We have suggested for the new episcopate a position which certainly offers less of the good things of this world than are enjoyed by the richer and longer established sees; but we venture to hope that the Church yet counts among her sons many and many an earnest man who would not scorn the hard work, the simple living, and unostentatious life of those who would seek rather to be 'ensamples to the flock' than 'lords over God's heritage.'

ART. IX.—LATTER YEARS OF BISHOP WILBERFORCE.

1. *Life of the Right Rev. Samuel Wilberforce, D.D.* By his son REGINALD G. WILBERFORCE. Vols. II. and III. (London, 1881, 1882.)
2. *Words of Counsel on some of the Chief Difficulties of the Day in the Writings of Samuel Wilberforce.* Collected by THOMAS VINCENT FOSBERY, M.A. (Oxford and London, 1875.)

ON the publication of Canon Ashwell's first volume of the *Life of Bishop Wilberforce,* following with ghastly closeness upon the author's unexpected death—victim as he was of conscientious overwork—we took occasion, in reviewing the fragment which he left us, to offer our estimate of the whole career and character of the great prelate. Nothing that we find in Mr. Wilberforce's two volumes leads us to retract or modify the opinions which we then adventured; so we shall not now retrace the trodden path. Sufficient profitable occupation is prepared for us in considering some of the conspicuous incidents of the Bishop's later life, exhibited as they are in the strong light of his son's memoir.

Chief among the materials of which the book is composed is the Bishop's private journal, which the biographer has handled with a strange unconcern for the well-established considerations which must, in the impossibility of creating definite and rigid rules for an infinite variety of speculative cases, define the limits of permission and of prohibition in the matter of literary revelations regarding persons still living or not long dead. Happily the objectionable passages are small in bulk compared with the long and varied array of matter valuable to all who study the vicissitudes of Church and State during an exceptionally interesting period of material progress in either sphere; and every day as the novelty of this gossip wears off will it fall more and more into its deserved condition of comparative insignificance.

Such a revelation of the defects which were a contributing element of the Bishop's many-sided character is a thing which is undoubtedly to be deplored. But the great essentials of that character will live down the accidents. Those who knew Bishop Wilberforce most closely were most clearly

aware of the abiding temptation—against which he so heroically laboured—of yielding to impulsiveness. That effusiveness to comparative strangers which was ignorantly set down to insincerity was in reality good-natured impulse overmastering cold-blooded caution. Such a disposition needed a safety valve, and unfortunately he sought it in a journal which he fondly believed to be secret. So that, in fact, the sum total—a considerable one we grant—of the damage is that the outsiders have been put on the level of the intimates, and that the imputation of feelings both quick and easily roused which had been a general though nebulous suspicion is now authenticated by more definite evidence. In short, we now know the worst of Samuel Wilberforce, and when that worst is dispassionately scanned, we may well say that any public man could esteem himself happy against whom nothing worse could be brought up. This is of course no excuse for the recklessness shown by the biographer in the publication, nor, to go further back, by the writer for perpetuating soliloquies which ought to have died in the conception, and for leaving their publication apparently quite unfenced. The Bishop used playfully to instruct neophytes in social etiquette in the three degrees of privacy which a letter-writer could impose on his epistle—'Private,' 'Confidential,' and, climax of all, 'Secret.' Was any 'Secret' stamped on the journal book?

But our chief concern is with Wilberforce the Churchman, and our readers will, we believe, thank us for passing away from this necessary reference to an unpleasant and, as far as reviewers are concerned, no longer novel, topic. Let us briefly inventory the contributions to modern Church history contained in these two volumes. The earlier one embraces the years spent in the diocese of Oxford, from 1848 to 1860; and the events which are its landmarks are the trouble with Mr. Allies, the Gorham judgment, the Papal Aggression, the unhappy controversy about adapted Roman books with Dr. Pusey, the revival of Convocation, in which, while contending with so many difficulties—not the least being those raised by his own brethren, and chiefly Archbishop Sumner—the Bishop bore himself so bravely and wisely; the Maurice case; the Ditcher and Denison suit; sorrows in his own family, from secessions and deaths; and the Divorce Act. The third volume completes the tale of the Episcopate of Oxford, from 1861 to 1869, and comprehends the few years spent at Winchester, from 1869 to the end of 1873. The prominent events of this period are the 'Essays and Reviews' affair; the acces-

sion of Archbishop Longley; the Colenso trouble; the Ritual controversy; the increase of the Episcopate at home and abroad; the accession of Archbishop Tait; the Irish Church disestablishment; the Sisterhood question; the Revision movement and Westminster scandal; the Glengarry scandal; the Athanasian Creed defence; and the Judicature Act.

It is manifestly impossible for us to say anything worth consideration upon even the half of this long list, comprising, as it does, without a single exception of importance, every incident which made for the prosperity of the Church of England, or tended to check its progress and discourage its friends during a quarter of a century. We are even more unable to take that still wider survey of the Memoir which would invite us to indulge in, if only there were space, the piquant revelations of the wide world of politics, literature, and social life contained in this book: some, indeed, belonging to the category of things which ought not to have seen the light, but others most legitimately revealed—of which we may take as an example Mr. Gladstone's mysterious letter, written in 1865, on the morrow of his defeat for Oxford, proclaiming, as if they were a series of Indian Avatars, the three political 'transmigrations' through which he felt himself destined to pass: two of them accomplished—his severance from his old party and the University wrench; the third mysterious and future, but ominously indicative of an advance towards democratic doctrines.

In making our choice of one or two ecclesiastical questions upon which we shall dwell, we desire chiefly to consider their present practical value and interest. Unfortunate as we consider it to rake up such embers, we heartily acknowledge the extreme interest which attaches to the spectacle of the conflict of the variant phases of Churchmanship, of which Bishop Wilberforce and Dr. Pusey were so eminently the fuglemen, as brought out in the questions, with the subtle psychical continuity running through them, of sisterhoods, of spiritual relations between priest and penitent, and of the adaptation of Roman Catholic books of devotion to Anglican use. This subject, however, was discussed in the last number of this Review, and we hold ourselves absolved from reverting to it.

Perhaps no episode is more practically valuable towards probing and appeasing the discontents of the present distress than that of the Bishop's connexion with the Ritual movement, illustrated as it is by some interesting particulars of

the inner history of the Ritual Commission, which, it will be recollected, sat from 1867 to 1870.

In order fully to estimate Bishop Wilberforce's action at this crisis of modern Church history, in which, as he so clearly appreciated, more was at stake than the mere ceremonial under discussion, it will be well to ascertain from his antecedent declarations what had been his own attitude towards the ceremonial development in the Church of England, both in its earlier and in its more pronounced phases.

In touching on this question in our former article, we quoted an extract from an early journal of Archdeacon Wilberforce, in which he spoke with pious horror of Mr. Oakeley's very meagre ritual at Margaret Street Chapel, and we called attention to a paper read by him, as Dean of Westminster, at the Winchester Archæological Congress of 1845, which revealed a grasp of the new science of Ecclesiology which was singularly contracted and conventional for so gifted a thinker.

A few years later, at the end of 1850 and beginning of 1851, and when Dr. Wilberforce was well established upon the throne of Oxford, the outcry over Pius IX.'s re-establishment of a territorial episcopate in England—sensationally known as the Papal Aggression—was by the cunning manipulation of Lord John Russell distorted into a brawling attack upon the modest manifestations of ritual which are now with universal goodwill adopted by all sorts of clergy, from the Archbishop at Lambeth to the curate of the humblest mission church, and some of which have not long since been pressed as things indifferent, if not rather laudable, by the more moderate section of the Low Church party. The catastrophe of Mr. Bennett's expulsion, due to Bishop Blomfield's lack of courage, had accentuated the crisis, and at a moment when sympathy would have been as golden as scolding was leaden, a cold, discouraging pastoral from nearly all the Bishops seemed to complete the downfall of those who were striving to raise the level of public worship. Suddenly the tide was stemmed by the virtual reply contained in Bishop Phillpotts' own courageous pastoral. But at this dark moment of the searching of hearts the Bishop of Oxford was not found standing by his brother of Exeter. He was amongst the mixed majority who were responsible for the chilling pronouncement. All this is painful to revive, and we only recall it to show how much the Bishop had profited by his life's experience and the responsibilities of the episcopate. We believe that neither in his narrower nor in

his broader days did worship as a systematic science distinctly touch the sympathies of his nature. He was profoundly reverential, he loved beauty, and he valued art; but the personal had always a contest in him with the corporate, and he dreaded the results of crystallizing reverence, art, and beauty in the service of God. That which, however, he did learn, and learning it knew how to turn to valuable account, was the respect due to those with whom systematic worship, in liturgies, in forms, and in buildings, was a stay of the soul, and in their behalf he took up a championship which was the more to be respected because in it personal gratification was not the operative cause of his energy.

Any one who will be at the pains to consult the interesting selection from Bishop Wilberforce's writings published by his confidential friend Mr. Fosbery in 1875, with the title of *Words of Counsel on some of the Chief Difficulties of the Day*, and read successively *Use and Misuse of Symbols*, taken from a Charge delivered in 1845, when the writer was Archdeacon of Surrey, and from the Bishop's two last Charges to the Diocese of Oxford of 1866 and 1869, will, we think, recognize the correctness of our analysis of the Bishop's ritual position, both upon the points on which he had and upon those on which he had not modified his opinions during that quarter of a century.

We are able now after this digression to appreciate Bishop Wilberforce's feeling in the crisis of which the Ritual Commission was the visible symbol, while we compare the popular excitement arising from the increasing boldness of the special pretensions of so-called ritualism with the earlier scare over the ecclesiological advance which culminated in the Durham letter. The chapter dealing with the history of that well-known Commission is picturesquely, though not quite chronologically, made to begin with a letter from the Bishop to Sir George Prevost of October 18, 1865. This contains the announcement: 'I *think* that there is little doubt that the Bishop of London (Tait) will try to get some legislative action in the way of altering the rubric about ritual. He would first try to get the Government to undertake it, if not the Bishops. The 'Government,' we may note, was then passing from Lord Palmerston to Lord Russell. The Bishop goes on to speak very sagaciously of the confusion which must result from the loss of the actual vantage ground of tacit compromise, leading as that would to having to define everything which was lawful and unlawful, without which there would be '*no law*.' He specially recites as the instance of what had better not be

defined 'the post of minister before the Communion table.' In conclusion he suggests two means of defensive action; one, it must be owned, speculative, 'the clergy understanding one another,' but the other the practical one of an address to the Archbishop and to the Bishop of the Diocese.

In the preceding session the ritual scare had been promoted in the House of Lords by an insignificant and ridiculous personage, whose advocacy ought to have been presumptive against any cause which he had taken up, the senile Marquess of Westmeath. This was the end of a career during which he had often burst upon the public with spasmodic manifestations which were more varied than exalted. However, this strange champion of the faith seems really to have inspired the gentle Archbishop Longley with some apprehension, and he took up the idea that it would be advisable to issue an anti-ritual address, signed by all the Bishops. On this Bishop Wilberforce, very differently advised from what he had been fourteen years previously, wrote to his Metropolitan (December 16, 1865) a letter commencing: 'My own mind is distinctly against an episcopal address on the ritual question,' and gave excellent reasons for his conclusion; 'but I doubt the constitutional correctness of these addresses. Each Bishop has of course a right to address his diocese.' But when they speak collectively it should be in synod.

Besides this, 'I am sure that the clergy are exceeding jealous of such addresses, and I believe that the laity would be even more so, if the address went against, instead of with, the popular opinion of the day.' Nor does the Bishop think the effect of the address would be good even if the Bishops could agree on it, for 'to get any agreement we must be most general in our terms.' They could not agree in detailed advice 'as to what part of the restored ritual we wished to discountenance.' This was well argued, for shirking detailed directions has always been a prime irritant in the anti-ritual mandates of prelates. The Bishop went on to instance Bishop Waldegrave, who would discountenance anything 'which advanced a step beyond Puritan Dissent.' Then he points out how such a document could be used to put down even such moderate ceremonial as that then carried out by the present Dean of York in Reading, from near which the letter was written. 'And this brings me to another most serious objection. There is, I believe, in the English mind a great move towards a higher ritual.' Even the Dissenters and the 'Scotch Puritan Establishment' showed it. 'I rejoice in the ground we have gained. I believe we should be better off if our

people desired yet further progress.' The risk is the priest outrunning the people. 'Now the ground which has been gained was gained by persons who at the time went beyond the common practice, and by bearing reproach for Christ have even now raised the common practice.' When he said this, true as it is, we doubt whether the Bishop fully grasped its practical force. The surpliced choir had been a reproach a short time before; what more was then the chasuble? But to resume. Such an address as the Archbishop contemplated would, so Bishop Wilberforce contended, throw all this good work back. We quote the conclusion of the letter integrally as a capital example of high but quite justifiable diplomacy:—

'But though this is my decided opinion, I would loyally support your Grace to the utmost limit of what I think lawful, if at last you resolve on any course. Only, may I suggest further that if this matter is to be discussed by us it should be under the following conditions:—

'I. There should be no circular notice of such discussion. This would assuredly get abroad, and of itself do much of the evil I have ventured above to suggest.

'II. There should be an absolute agreement:

'(*a*). That *no* address should finally be adopted unless it was adopted unanimously.

'(*b*). That it should state what we did, and what we did *not*, wish to discourage.

'(*c*). That there should be a pledge of absolute silence out of the room as to the whole subject, that neither the *Record* nor the *Church Times* might be able to blazon the matter abroad and stir up strife.

'I hope I have not wearied your Grace; but as you asked my opinion I felt bound in duty to put, as far as possible, my whole views before you.'

We have recapitulated this letter at much length, from our conviction of its extreme value as expressing most fully and clearly and withal unreservedly the views held on the ritual question not only by Bishop Wilberforce individually, but by that large phalanx of moderate High Churchmen ('the great historical party,' as they are fawningly called when there is any wish to cajole them) of which he was the spokesman. It was intended for only one eye, and now that it has been made public it is out of date. But if it could happily have come in the freshness of its authorship before the world it must have told distinctively, healthfully, and strongly, far more than the Bishop's Charges did, with all their superb richness of style, for it was these very qualities of style which called attention away from the matter.

The Archbishop, however, was not convinced by the

Bishop's letter, and in his reply explained that the Episcopal document should be one of counsel not of authority, but conceded that unless it were unanimously adopted, or nearly so, it would be useless.

'He anticipated no difficulty in getting a unanimous consent to the discarding of vestments and incense, and adhering to the surplice. The Archbishop also seemed to think from the letter that the Bishop looked forward to a general restoration of vestments and incense, which the Bishop's answer most emphatically contradicts :—

'"December 24, 1865.

'"I thank you cordially for your kind consideration of my objections. I need scarcely say that I will give my most careful attention to your answers. I will now only correct what seems to me a misapprehension of my meaning in my letter, into which some inadvertence of mine has, I fear, led your Grace. I did not mean to imply that I approved of the use of the vestments and incense; so far from it, I have prevented it in my diocese. What I did mean was that I thought our individual action, and not our collective, was our safe course. I venture, too, to think that there is a wide difference between addressing a brother Bishop and addressing the clergy.

'"Such *advice* must, I fear, wear the aspect of an attempt to exercise unlawful authority."'

This is a point at which we may reasonably note a peculiarity in Archbishop Longley's views, of which his friend's biographer does not take notice, but which exercised a strong because quiet influence on the progress of events. Genial and tolerant as he was, and little disposed to cut worship down to the dead Puritan level, there was yet one detail of ceremonial as to which he was inexorable. Yet in the few intervening years it has passed in the estimation of thoughtful men from the schedule of ultra-ritualistic enormities to that of the questions which may be calmly canvassed as having two sides to them by moderate men—as for example it has been by the Bishop of Durham in his recent Charge—just as the surplice in the pulpit was debated thirty years ago. We mean of course the distinctive Eucharistic dress.

In thus shutting his ears to a claim which could adduce the authority of our greatest divines down to the Restoration, the Archbishop merely showed himself a man of the generation to which he belonged, while in contrast, as is well known, his statesmanlike policy regarding the eastward position stopped any attempt to limit or stifle it on the part of the Ritual Commission. We now reach a fact which gave the key to the correspondence.

There had been a discussion at the meeting of the Bishops in the previous May, when Bishops Jackson, of Lincoln,

and Sumner, of Winchester, proposed a test case which would of course have brought the question to trial before the Courts. Bishop Wilberforce, while opposing legislation or prosecution, pressed fatherly counsel; Bishop Bickersteth, of Ripon, was for the case, so that a competent legal authority might declare what was the liberty of the Church of England, which produced the rejoinder from Bishop Thirlwall, 'May I ask what hinders your getting an opinion?' Mr. Wilberforce, by the way, forgets to refer to an episode of much importance in the ritual campaign: the case and opinion against vestments, &c., obtained by the Bishops from Sir H. Cairns, Sir R. Palmer, and Mr. Mellish, answered by the counter-case from the English Church Union of June 1866, which elicited a variety of curious and valuable opinions from various eminent lawyers, of whom Sir R. Phillimore, Sir F. Kelly, Sir W. Bovill, Mr. (Lord Justice) James, Dr. Deane, Mr. Coleridge, and Mr. Hannen, declared the legality of the vestments, and Sir R. Phillimore, Mr. James, Dr. Deane, and Mr. Hannen, of the lights, against Sir W. Bovill and Mr. Coleridge; Sir F. Kelly pronouncing no opinion; and all the opinions being unfavourable to the lawfulness of incense. But previously to this event, the Bishops had met in 1866, at the early date of February 5. After the statement from Bishop Ellicott, of Gloucester and Bristol, that Mr. Upton Richards had told him that there was a most general readiness to yield to the pastoral office of the Bishop, Bishop Harold Browne, of Ely, thought that the resolutions of what was legal and what was permissible, and the memorials before them, should be taken together. 'He desired to meet any overtures of peace from an extreme party.' Bishop Baring, of Durham, on the other hand, was of opinion that 'there should be no compromise with men who are disturbing wilfully and wickedly the peace of the Church.' Bishop Jackson, of Lincoln, strongly pressed getting a legal opinion and then going to the Courts. Bishop Tait, of London,

thought the best course would be if the Ritualists would submit to fatherly counsel. The difficulty of the case was, he thought, increased because doctrine was involved. He said, "You must, in the Church of England, allow a large latitude of doctrine." He differed from the view of drawing a case for opinion, on the ground that it would be impossible to make a case wide enough.

'The proper mode of dealing with the case is, getting the Bishop the general controlling power intended by the rubric for him to possess. It was always intended that the Ordinary should have it.'

He added, however, that in order to meet the risk of

diversity, provision should be made that the Bishop should consult certain other persons, with laity learned in the law. 'The Archbishop should himself be bound to act with his vicar-general.' We dwell on these words, which show, whether the plan in itself would have worked or not, that Archbishop Tait's original fresh thoughts differed widely from the policy with which fate made him familiar, when he had placed himself upon the fatal incline of repressive legislation. The debate was continued on two more days, and was memorable for a sentence from Bishop Phillpotts, speaking with the experience of about ninety years, 'If you try to enforce the rubric you will have a rebellion; try to alter it, and you will cause a shipwreck.' Ultimately, when a division was taken, the address was supported by thirteen votes, and opposed by Archbishop Trench and Bishops Thirlwall, Wilberforce, Hamilton, Jackson, Ellicott, Campbell, and Fitzgerald. This was far from the virtual unanimity which the Archbishop considered essential, and so it fell through.

We may leap over a year, merely pointing out that in the interval the Bishop delivered a Charge, to which we have already referred, in which he dwelt with, so we think, too much pomp of language on the ritual question. February, 1867, found the Bishops again assembled on the ritual question, and sitting 'with closed doors.' Mr. Wilberforce does not seem to appreciate that this was no meeting at Lambeth, but one of the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, and that its business was 'to consider the answer they should make to the Report of the Lower House on the ritual question.' That Report, emanating from a committee of the Lower House was written by its chairman, the Dean of Ely, now Bishop of Carlisle, and was a wise and temperate document, out of which a *modus vivendi* might have been developed. The answer, drawn up and moved by Bishop Wilberforce, and seconded by Bishop Tait, concluded: 'Our judgment is that no alteration from long sanctioned and usual ritual ought to be made in our churches until the sanction of the Bishop of the diocese has been obtained thereto.' It is obvious that, peaceful as the tone of this pronouncement may have been, it was too short and vague an answer properly to cover all the positions advanced by the Lower House. It was merely operative in shelving the one most promising, because most definite, scheme of reconciliation which had emanated from any constituted authority. General principles are all very well when they are likely to lead to definite results, but of this the Ritualists could not be certain. They desired to be told

what rites would in any case be allowed, and of what they could have no hope. Matters were thus at a deadlock, the two sides resting on their opinions, when affairs suddenly became very critical, and the Bishops had to hold a meeting, described in a letter from the Bishop of Oxford to Bishop Hamilton of March 6.

The cause of the crisis was that Lord Shaftesbury threatened a bill to annihilate the historical continuity of the Church in regard to vesture, and to reduce the dress of the ministering clergy to that of the Fiftieth Canon. This, as the Bishop truly perceived, would have been 'a suicidal step,' yet he found it favoured, not only by Archbishop Thomson and Bishops Baring, Waldegrave, Bickersteth, and Jeune, but by Bishop Harold Browne and Archbishop Longley. The Bishop seems at the meeting to have urged the inconveniences of Lord Shaftesbury, with his known and strongly accentuated views, constituting himself promoter of such a measure. This was in itself a good argument, but it naturally elicited a specific rejoinder, and he was met by the question, 'Then, if the Archbishop brought in such a bill?' His reply to this home-thrust was, 'I said I should deprecate any such measure, but if the Archbishop thought it necessary, and introduced it, I should not oppose it.' It was clear by what followed that the Bishop, in making this admission, said more than he meant to express. The practical conclusion was, 'that Shaftesbury should be hounded off by being told that the Archbishop was preparing such a bill, and a Committee was settled to draw it up.' The Bishop invoked the influence of Mr. Gladstone, always powerful, even when he was, as at that time, in opposition, to stay the disastrous policy; nor did he neglect, on March 7, to address a strong expostulation to the Archbishop, in which he took occasion to quote the answer which the latter had given a few weeks before to the English Church Union: 'I have already publicly declared my determination never to consent to any alteration in any part of the Book of Common Prayer without the full concurrence of Convocation.'

A hand-to-hand struggle then ensued, Mr. Gladstone gallantly throwing himself into the breach, and personally conferring with Archbishops Longley and Thomson and Bishop Tait. In the meanwhile another actor was brought on the scene, the late Lord Derby, then Prime Minister. The Archbishop and Bishop Ellicott saw him, and Bishop Wilberforce wrote to him. Ultimately, on March 26, the Archbishop wrote to the Bishop of Oxford:—

'Lord Derby informs me the Cabinet are unanimously of opinion that any proceeding in regard to recent ritualistic practices had better be taken by a Commission than through immediate legislation. He asks my opinion, and requests me to collect that of the Archbishops and Bishops, whether the inquiry on the part of the Commission should be limited to the rubric prescribing the ornaments of the Church and of the ministers, or should extend to other rubrics and other parts of the Book of Common Prayer. My own view is decidedly in favour of the limitation, and I will thank you to let me know your opinion at your earliest convenience.'

To this letter the Bishop replied as follows :—

'March 27, 1867.

'I am clear that the inquiries of the Commission should be limited to the rubric touching the ornaments of the Church and the ministers. I think it—after our experience of the last Commission—very important that the terms of the Commission should intimate that Convocation would be afterwards consulted. I reserve my own opinion that no legislation is best of all.'

After all, the inquiries of the Commission were not limited; and, as events turned out, it was fortunate that the Bishop's counsels, cautious as they might seem to be to a superficial judgment, were overruled. A large and powerful Commission of 'summities' in Church and State, sitting on the one Ornaments Rubric, must have justified such a draft on valuable time by rending it piecemeal. If they were the pack, it was the fox. On the other hand, a Commission, however magnificent, which was licensed not only to wander at its sweet will over the wide field of all the rubrics, but also to take the Lectionary in hand, was in fact empowered to pass in review the whole worship of the Church of England, and thus became an employment worthy of statesmen no less than of divines. So the electric current, thus widely diffused, became harmless. The Commission sat four years. Its new Lectionary and the Shortened Services Act are distinct gains to the Church; the proposed code of amended rubrics are an interesting contribution to liturgical literature; and the deadlock to which it brought the opposition to the Athanasian Creed and the Ornaments Rubric made it, in spite of itself, a signal benefactor to the Church of England.

No way mollified by the appointment of the Commission, Lord Shaftesbury moved the second reading of his bill on May 14, and the Archbishop in amendment moved its postponement for two months, which he carried by a majority of fifteen in a House of 107 peers. In the majority were the

Archbishops of Canterbury and Dublin and six Bishops, and in the minority eleven Bishops. The bill was then dropped.

The Ritual Commission of twenty-nine members, under Archbishop Longley's chairmanship, met for the first time on June 17, and after holding nineteen sittings, which were divided between the examination of witnesses and deliberations, agreed upon its first Report on August 19. The minority of the body, who looked with more or less favour on ceremonial development, early associated themselves into a working party, in which the Bishop held a leading position. We may accept Mr. Wilberforce's narrative at this point as substantially correct, though we must observe that the term Committee is hardly a correct definition for the minority of a deliberative assembly. No one would call Sir Stafford Northcote's following in the House of Commons a Committee.

'Immediately on the appointment of the Commission, some of the members agreed to form a private committee, and to move *pari passu* with the meetings of the Commissioners. This committee consisted of Lord Beauchamp, the Bishop of Oxford, the Dean of Ely (now Bishop of Carlisle), Canon Gregory, the Right Hon. Sir R. Phillimore, the Right Hon. J. G. Hubbard, the Right Hon. A. J. B. Beresford-Hope, and the Rev. T. W. Perry. The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol joined, but after one or two meetings deserted and went over to the other side. This committee, although less than a third of the whole body, was enabled, by showing a united front, to really guide the Commission, and to virtually settle the Report. At the final meeting two draft Reports were submitted for consideration by the Commissioners: one by Mr. Walpole, the other by Mr. Hubbard. Mr. Walpole withdrew his in favour of Mr. Hubbard's, which, with a few alterations, was adopted. This draft Report, as the diary shows, was in reality drawn by the Bishop; and the secret of its success was the moderation of tone and the judicious use of the word 'restrain' with regard to vestments, instead of the word 'abolish' or 'prohibit.' The main body of the Commissioners failed to perceive the elasticity of this word, which in fact did leave a loophole for the regulated use of vestments. Lord Beauchamp, at whose house these meetings were held, thus testifies of the part the Bishop took: "I cannot refrain from writing you these few lines to say how fully I recognise the discretion and skill with which you have steered us. How others could have been brought to agree I cannot divine. Our escape has been marvellous."'

The official record of the adoption of this Report, taken from the minutes of the Commission as printed in its first blue-book, is as follows:—

'Suggestions for draft Reports by Mr. Hubbard and Mr. Walpole were laid upon the table.

'Earl Stanhope then brought forward the motion of which he had given notice at the last meeting.

'Mr. Walpole moved as an amendment, that the draft Report of Mr. Hubbard be taken as the basis to be now considered. Lord Stanhope thereupon withdrew his motion, and the amendment was adopted.'

In order to estimate the value of this noticeable pronouncement, we need only take notice of the two really important sentences:—

'We are of opinion that it is expedient to restrain in the public services of the united Church of England and Ireland all variations in respect of vesture from that which has long been the established usage of the said united Church, and we think that this may be best secured by providing aggrieved parishioners with an easy and effectual process for complaint and redress. We are not yet prepared to recommend to your Majesty the best mode of giving effect to these conclusions, with a view at once to secure the objects proposed and to promote the peace of the Church; but we have thought it our duty in a matter to which great interest is attached not to delay the communication to your Majesty of the results at which we have already arrived.'

As Mr. Wilberforce points out, the one important word is 'restrain,' because it can as little mean by any natural use of language 'prohibit' as it means 'give rein to.' As no one, then, out of Nephelococcygia, considering the condition of England in 1867, as no one now, considering what it has become in 1883, would desire the pell-mell adoption of vestments; so all out of Nephelococcygia, Ritualists no less than Recordists, must desire in some way to 'restrain' that adoption. All accordingly ought to have welcomed the moderation and common-sense of the Report. If it required any further explanation this would be found in the qualifications appended, those of the signatory Commissioners:—

'We agree to the main proposition contained in this Report, and have therefore signed it, upon the understanding that it does not exclude the consideration of cases in which the authority of the Bishop and the rights of the parishioners and congregations are carefully guarded. 'ROBERT J. PHILLIMORE.

'A. J. B. BERESFORD-HOPE.

'In signing this Report, I think it right to express my conviction that any power to "restrain" the variations in respect of vesture to which the Report refers ought to be limited to cases in which "grave offence" is likely to be given by introducing such "vesture" into churches against the mind of the people; and also to state that by "aggrieved parishioners" I understand to be meant those who, being

bonâ fide members and communicants of the Church of England, have a reasonable ground for "complaint and redress."

'THOMAS W. PERRY.'

When we calmly weigh these very obvious considerations it is absolutely painful to read the passionate mistaking of the Report from the pen of Dr. Pusey, representing as that does the error of many more devoted Churchmen, whose verifying faculty can certainly not be placed on a level with that of the great Professor:—

'It seems to me a complete extirpation of the vestments, root and branch. I cannot conceive the work done more completely, though it might have been done in a more painful way. It is an absolute and complete defeat. It would have been far better to have had all Shaftesbury's bill, and let him do his worst.'

Mr. Wilberforce prints an able letter from the Bishop to his son, Ernest, now Bishop of Newcastle, who seems to have read the Report much as Dr. Pusey had done.

It is hardly needful to recapitulate from the minute book, printed in the fourth Blue Book, the various propositions for a limited permission, under certain specified conditions, of the vestments. These were all defeated, though one of them, to permit them in chapels of ease, was only so by a majority of two. Had it not been for the Archbishop's bias, which we have already noticed, we believe that some understanding might have been reached.

The second Report of the Ritual Commission was signed in April 1868. Mr. Wilberforce recapitulates it correctly:—

'Of the twenty-nine Commissioners, six did not sign the Report at all; four, including the Bishop, signed with qualifications. The Report recommended legislation on the subject of incense and candles; it was against this proposal that the Bishop protested. After hearing evidence, and after all the arguments which had been adduced, he was still of the opinion, which has already been so fully stated, "that offence, whether caused by excess or defect in Divine service, may be removed by strengthening the hands of the Bishop, with appeal to the Archbishop." The Bishop further protested because he was convinced that no law could regulate gesture and posture, which, in his opinion, were much better left to the good sense and good feeling of each parish.'

The Bishop's own feelings are well expressed in a letter to Archbishop Longley of April 17:—

'I am asked to send you the printed paper which will accompany this from Mr. Kempe (*sic*). It expresses the view which the Dean of Ely, Mr. Hubbard, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Hope, Sir R. Phillimore, and

myself (and, except as regards the possible legality of the altar lights, Mr. Coleridge) take of the second Report as agreed to. But as the appeal has been lodged since this paper was drawn up, some of us would be glad of the opportunity of revising it, if time allows, before it is formally attached to the second Report. I cannot say to you the pain it gives me not to assent to anything which has your sanction. I cannot but believe that our common aim would have been better promoted by an united advice that the Bishop and Archbishop should be empowered to stop these things, than by a divided Report advising the compelling the Bishop to act, and so, in my judgment, simply abrogating his office.

The conclusion of much divided counsels was that the Bishop of Oxford and Dean Goodwin signed the Report with a paper of reasons for not fully accepting it, and that Sir Robert Phillimore, Mr. Beresford-Hope, Mr. Hubbard, and Canon Gregory adopted that paper as their reasons for refusing to sign at all. Lord Beauchamp and Mr. Perry explained their dissent in carefully drawn papers, and although Dean Stanley and Mr. Coleridge signed, they jointly put in a plea for further liberty.

The machinery which the majority of the Commission proposed for dealing with vestments, lights, and incense was the Bishop, with an appeal to the Archbishop, and although 'restrain' was on their lips they seem to have thought of nothing besides suppression. The delators were to be one or more of the church or chapel wardens, or else at least five resident parishioners in parishes of more than 1,000 population, and three in those of less.

This was of course the cockatrice's egg from which were hatched those three aggrieved parishioners who have helped to make the Public Worship Regulation Act so odious and contemptible.

At this point Mr. Wilberforce's memoir quite loses sight of the Ritual Commission. Yet it made two more Reports, while from the eighty-sixth to the hundred-and-eighth and last meeting, that is from December 15, 1869, to June 28, 1870, the Bishop of Winchester acted as chairman, having been called to that post in consequence of Archbishop Tait's long and dangerous illness, which occurred before Bishop Jackson's appointment as Commissioner.

The third Report, dated January 12, 1870, deals exclusively with that which is after all the legacy for which the Commission will be remembered—namely, the new Lectionary, elaborated by a committee of the body and adopted by the entire Commission—with the lamentable deterioration, prompted, it would seem, by a cowardly dread of so-called public opinion.

the omission from the Lectionary of the lessons from Tobit which it had been proposed to retain. After all, the majority was small, and a fight of two days was maintained, at which the Bishop did gallant service on the right side.

The fourth and final Report, of June 12, 1870, embodies the whole proposal of revised rubrics, and has about it one wonderful characteristic for which we never can be too thankful: that whereas in the eyes of politicians the Commission was mainly set up to give decent interment to the Ornaments Rubric, and also that the latitudinarian faction believed they possessed in it a sure instrument for doing some harm to the Athanasian Creed, yet rubric and Creed both of them came out of the inquiry and stood in the Prayer-Book untouched and unscathed. It was like the enchanted maze in a fairy tale. In regard both to the important rubric and to the infinitely more important Creed, the enemy was there in a majority full of energy for the work of destruction. One thing only was wanting—namely, unanimity as to the policy to be adopted in the attack—and this indispensable preliminary was, when it came to be considered by so many such superior people, a difficulty past solution. Their language was confounded, and the builders had to abandon the rising Babel of a Church of England with maimed ceremonial and mutilated creeds. The Fourth Report, with its accompanying memoranda, is a unique curiosity. There are twenty-seven signatures and two abstentions (Sir Robert Phillimore and Lord Carnarvon), and of the signers every one put his hand to one or several limitations, the most noteworthy one being an omnibus memorandum with seventeen names, of which the first was that of Archbishop Tait.

'We, the undersigned members of your Majesty's Commission, are unable to concur in the course which has been taken by the Commission with respect to the Athanasian Creed. The objections felt by several of us will be found stated, with the signatures, in the accompanying papers.'

Of course recommendations which had secured so little unanimity among their authors could not appeal to the public with much authority. Nevertheless the Shortened Services Act emerged from the waters, and the scheme of amended rubrics received for some years the respectful attention of both Convocations, while it is not due to any want of zeal on the part of Churchmen, but to grave considerations of prudence, emphasized as these were by the general election of 1880, that the Prayer-Book has not become the sport of Parliamentary debate.

The opposition to the Athanasian Creed was not, as might have been supposed, quelled by the *fiasco* in the Ritual Commission, and within two years it again broke out acutely. For the history of the conflict which raged within the Episcopate and in Convocation from 1871 to 1873, we refer our readers to the fourteenth chapter of the third volume of the Memoirs. For its happy ending Churchmen cannot be too grateful to the memory of Bishop Wilberforce. It was a glorious termination to his great career; more glorious because it was necessarily unostentatious and secret. Nor should the memory be lost of the public meeting in defence of the Creed, due to Lord Beauchamp's bold prescience, which was held in S. James's Hall on January 31, 1873. Before this gathering, innovators professed to disbelieve that there was an educated lay public opinion in the land in favour of the Creed. No one has since that day dared to commit himself to that paradox.

ART. X.—DEPRIVATION AS A PENALTY FOR CONTEMPT OF COURT IN ECCLESIASTICAL CASES.

Bill intituled An Act to amend the Law as to Contempts of Court. (Presented by the Lord Chancellor.) Ordered to be printed 8th March, 1883.

THE Bill the title of which is at the head of this Paper has been introduced by the Lord Chancellor, and is now awaiting its second reading in the House of Lords. Some of its provisions appear seriously to affect the position of the Church, and to these we invite the earnest attention of Churchmen.

The proposed Act purports to alter the law as to contempts of Court, but under the word 'Court,' it (*inter alia*) comprises 'every Ecclesiastical Court in England having power to signify any contumacy or contempt to Her Majesty in Chancery with a view to the issue of a writ *de contumace capiendo*, under any statute,' and directs that it shall extend to the Court of Final Appeal before Her Majesty in the Privy Council,' and to 'all orders of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council incidental to any appeal or other proceeding in such Court of Final Appeal' (cl. 19).

By clause 16 it proposes, so far as relates to ecclesiastical questions, to enact as follows:—

'In any case of disobedience to any order of a Court of competent jurisdiction made against an individual holder of any office within the meaning of this Act, as to any matter concerning the duty of such office, which he may be required by such order either to do, or to desist or abstain from doing, it shall be lawful for the Court (being in the case of the holder of an ecclesiastical office a Court of Ecclesiastical jurisdiction) by further order, to be made on notice to the person so offending, to fix, and from time to time to enlarge, for any sufficient cause, such limited time as to the Court may seem reasonable for compliance with such order, on pain of deprivation of such office; and if within the time so limited, such order shall not be duly complied with, or if the same shall afterwards be further wilfully disobeyed, the office so held by such person may thereupon be declared by such Court to be, and the same shall become and be vacant, as if such person were naturally dead; and in that case such person shall not be capable of being again appointed or presented to such office until after the expiration of three years from the time when the same was so declared vacant.'

And then follows a proviso protecting the right of appeal.

The word 'office' is in clause 19 defined to mean 'all ecclesiastical preferments, promotions, and benefices, the holders of which are subject to the jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical Courts of any diocese or province in England.'

This Bill, therefore, while it leaves unimpaired the previous coercive powers of the Ecclesiastical Courts, creates a new punishment for contempt by means of deprivation.

Those previous powers were twofold—imprisonment and suspension.

(1) Imprisonment, when the person who disobeys the mandate of an Ecclesiastical Court is pronounced contumacious and in contempt, and upon this being signified to the Queen in Chancery, the writ *de contumace capiendo* issues, under which the offender is committed to prison. This right is expressly reserved by and brought within the purview of the proposed Act (see clause 4); and although by clause 1 imprisonment for contempt is not to exceed three months, yet, as by clause 3 any continuance or repetition of the contempt renders the offender liable to subsequent imprisonment for a like term by summary order, and 'so on from time to time as often as the same shall happen,' the possible duration of imprisonment is by no means practically diminished.

(2) Suspension, '*ab officio et a beneficio*,' for a longer or shorter period at the discretion of the Court. This right has, after a protracted struggle, been decided by the House of Lords[1] to be properly exercisable by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and the Ecclesiastical Courts in cases of contumacy. It entails the loss to the offending clergyman of the intermediate profits of his benefice, and adequate provision can therefore always be made for the performance in the meantime of its duties.

It will be observed that by neither of these modes of punishment was the ecclesiastical status of the clergyman permanently affected. The former involved the loss of his personal liberty: the latter, the suspension for a time of his ministrations; but in either case he was capable of being remitted to his original position.

But deprivation, which was of a totally different character, was never permitted on summary process as a punishment merely for contempt. 'It does not appear' (said the Lord Chancellor, in Martin *v.* Mackonochie, 7 Probate Division, 101, when delivering the judgment of the Judicial Committee) 'that there is any precedent for the infliction of the penalty of deprivation for mere contumacy or contempt. In Hebbert *v.* Purchas

[1] Mackonochie *v.* Lord Penzance, 6 Appeal Cases, 434.

Law Rep. 4 P.C. 312) such precedents were searched for in vain; and Lord Hatherley, delivering the judgment of the Judicial Committee, said, "Without pausing to inquire whether by any substantive proceeding founded on the ecclesiastical offence of disobedience to the Order in Council that has been already pronounced, a sentence of deprivation or amotion might have been obtained, we are of opinion that we cannot proceed to enforce compliance with the order which has been disobeyed by any summary process of contempt through the medium of amotion."'

And the reason is obvious, if we bear in mind what the sentence of deprivation meant. As an ecclesiastical censure, whereby a clergyman is deprived of his parsonage, vicarage, or other spiritual promotion or dignity, it has always been regarded as an extreme penalty, and reserved for aggravated offences. Oughton, in his *Ordo Judiciorum*, tit. 137, in speaking of it says, 'Cum ob delicta majora quis ab ecclesiastico beneficio penitus amovetur.' And in the great oracle of ecclesiastical practice, Godolphin's book, a cause of deprivation is stated to be 'incorrigibleness, and obstinate disobedience to the approved canons of the Church, as also to the Ordinary.' But we need not revert to records of antiquity. It will suffice to refer to one or two high legal authorities of modern times. Lord Justice Thesiger,[1] after speaking of suspension as a punishment for contumacy, added,

'Deprivation and degradation, as punishments for ever altering the status of an offending clergyman, stood upon a different footing.'

And Lord Justice James, in the same case, said :—

'The Ecclesiastical coercions were, in the case of a clerk, suspension *ab officio et a beneficio*, to be followed, if necessary, by the ultimate coercion of excommunication. I leave out deprivation and degradation, because I conceive them not to be so much coercions as final and irreversible sentences pronounced on offenders to whom no hope of restoration is left.'

Such being the nature of deprivation, it follows, almost as a matter of course, that it could only be pronounced by a formal sentence upon the hearing of a suit in which specific articles were charged and proved against the offender, and when the Court, therefore, had the fullest means before it of carefully weighing the gravity of the offences charged, in connexion with all the attendant circumstances. 'Deprivation,' says Lord Chief-Justice Coleridge, 'could not take place except with all the formalities of a plenary suit.'

[1] Martin *v.* Mackonochie, 4 Queen's Bench Div. 727.

What, then, is the sudden emergency, what the overwhelming dangers, which have caused Parliament to be invoked to arm the Ecclesiastical Courts with this new and formidable weapon?

It could hardly be the desire to punish more severely what is necessarily felt to be the unseemly spectacle of clerical insubordination. For, setting aside the fact that no legal punishment ought to be merely vindictive, and that the Ecclesiastical Law especially is never weary of declaring that it acts solely for the reformation of the offender and for the benefit of the Church, we cannot but think that the Ecclesiastical Courts might safely trust to protracted imprisonment and the temporary loss of subsistence for the family, as sufficiently deplorable remedies to cure the feverish vanity and swelling pride, to which some rather hasty critics are fond of attributing every symptom of resistance on the part of the clergy to constituted authority.

Another possible reason might be suggested, that, with a view to satisfy public opinion, a shorter and sharper method of coercion is required, which, while more effective for its purpose, would be less likely to attract attention or to arouse sympathy. The impolicy, at all events, of Mr. Green's long incarceration has come home to an inconveniently large number of persons who, without being High Churchmen, are not admirers of the Church Association. We venture to think that anyone who could propose such a remedy for feelings thus excited is imperfectly acquainted with the nature of the disease, or with what is known as human nature. For so deeply implanted in the minds of Englishmen of the better class, certainly in the minds of English Churchmen, is the principle of submission to law, that when Courts are felt to be its true exponents, whatever may be the resistance in individual cases, there is not on the part of the bystanders any acquiescence in or toleration of disobedience. It may be almost assumed as an axiom, that the necessity of increased powers of compelling submission to judicial decisions is in the inverse ratio to the respect paid to the Courts by which they are pronounced.

If, in fact, there does exist any such acquiescence or sympathy, may it not be rather attributable to the distrust which has unhappily arisen in the minds of many Churchmen with reference to the constitution of the present Ecclesiastical Courts? In saying this, we do not venture to impute the slightest blame to the Courts themselves. But it is useless to disguise the fact that, owing to the extreme and almost unique

difficulty of the subjects with which they have had to deal, to the multiplicity of the interests involved, and to the all but impossibility of discerning the right path when the spiritual and temporal jurisdictions shade so imperceptibly into each other—combined with what we conceive to be great defects in their own constitution and procedure—there have been a vacillation and inconsistency in some of their judgments, and a tendency, we must believe from the best and highest motives, to substitute compromise for decision in others, which have left an uneasy impression on too many minds. This feeling probably culminated in the final decision of the Judicial Committee on the Ornaments Rubric Question. For it cannot be denied that the ordinary Davus-like English mind, not versed in legal subtleties, and ignorant of that path of inquiry which led the Judicial Committee (after, it must be owned, some meanderings) to their ultimate goal, was bewildered by the discovery that a rubric which at first sight appeared so simple, and the observance of which was made not optional but imperative, really bore in the eyes of those great lawyers a meaning which had baffled the acumen of many a legal Œdipus. It is true that this did not touch the principle of submission as a general duty, but in the view of many even of those who held Ritualism in horror, it made a very sensible difference in the tone and temper with which they regarded the conduct of offenders, who might think that in this particular instance the Judicial Committee had overstepped the border line which separates judicial from legislative functions.

Apart from the above considerations, we are not aware of any peculiar exigency which calls for the proposed change, but there are special circumstances which seem to make its suggestion at the present moment singularly inappropriate. For in the year 1881, when discontent and difficulty had reached their climax, Her Majesty appointed a Royal Commission to inquire into the constitution and working of the Ecclesiastical Courts. When we find amongst the Commissioners appointed the names of the two Archbishops, the Bishops of Winchester, Oxford, and Truro, Lords Bath, Blachford, Chichester, Coleridge, Devon, and Penzance, the Deans of Durham and Peterborough, Drs. Westcott and Stubbs, Sir R. Phillimore, Sir R. Cross, Sir Walter James, and Dr. Deane, not to mention others of the highest reputation, it is clear that is was intended to be, and was, a body whose opinions and representations would command the deepest respect, and would be likely to influence future legislation.

It is understood that this Commission has been actively prosecuting its inquiries, but its actual proceedings are at present shrouded in mystery, except that there is good reason to believe that its Report will very shortly appear. We have, indeed, a glimpse of the views and hopes, with reference to it, of one of its most distinguished members, the late Archbishop of Canterbury, whose voice can now only speak from his grave. For the recently published work of Mr. Beresford Hope on *Worship and Order* contains the following note (p. 297):—

'This is a fitting place to note that in the last conversation which I had upon Church questions with Archbishop Tait, for whom I cherish a very deep respect and affection, about the end of July 1882 he acknowledged himself a convert to separate judgments in contrast to the collective judgment which marks the decisions of the Judicial Committee, and expressed the hope that the result of this Commission might be the constitution of some reformed tribunal, before which the Ritual questions might be tried again, without respect for the existing judgments.'

It will be remembered that Archbishop Tait was himself one of the assessors in the case of Ridsdale *v.* Clifton.

Now, we submit to the judgment of English Churchmen, whether they agree with or differ from the views we personally entertain, that the present at any rate is not the befitting moment to rivet a new chain upon the necks of the English clergy. At a time when the relations of Church and State are so nearly thrown out of gear that some are beginning to despair of any restoration of their harmonious action, while those who most deeply value the inexpressible benefits resulting from the connexion between them are watching with breathless anxiety the course of events, we deprecate, almost passionately, any premature movement which may occasion needless friction and disturbance. There is for the moment a lull, and we are not aware of any case either pending or in the immediate future which could call for the operation of more stringent powers. Why should not that part of the Bill which deals with ecclesiastical questions be at least postponed until the result of the Ecclesiastical Judicature Commission has been ascertained? We may then hope that some new *modus vivendi* will be found which may reconcile the respective rights and interests of Church and State—in which case all questions of coercive jurisdiction must necessarily come under review, and most probably under new conditions, which would render intermediate legislation vexatious and oppressive. There is also the danger that if this

Bill be passed in its present form, we shall be told, according to the 'Vestigia nulla retrorsum' cant of modern legislation, that Parliament in its wisdom has taken a step in advance which can never be retraced.

We plead at least for delay. Nor do we plead without sanguine hope. The rest of the Bill is open to no similar objection, for it is only when we reach ecclesiastical questions that we enter into the sacred domain of conscience. The desire of symmetrical completeness may well have led the draftsman to bring together cases which are really widely different; but the Bill itself is happily now in the hands of those who, while vigilant in guarding the sanctity of law, are, as we believe, also keenly alive to the interests of the Church. It cannot be that those hands will, at so critical a moment, hastily and without excuse throw a new firebrand into the smouldering heap of theological controversy.

RT. XI.—ON THE USE OF UNFERMENTED WINE IN THE HOLY COMMUNION.

1. *Passover Wine.* By NORMAN KERR, M.D., F.L.S. (London, 1883.)
2. *The Church of England Temperance Chronicle,* February 10, 17, 24, March 3, 1883.

OUR recent article in which it was shown that the use of Unfermented Wine in the Holy Communion could claim neither the sanction of the New Testament nor of the Primitive Church, has, as we anticipated, called forth a certain amount of criticism and remonstrance. It appears desirable to add a few remarks with regard to (1) a lecture delivered by Dr. Norman Kerr, in the rooms of the Medical Society of London, on 20th February, 1883, "containing a statement of the truth as to 'Passover Wine,' and a refutation of certain charges of the *Church Quarterly* reviewer;" and (2) some correspondence in the *Church of England Temperance Chronicle* occasioned by our observations on certain points which appeared to us open to objection in the policy of the Church of England Temperance Society and the management of the newspaper which is its weekly official organ. A few supplementary illustrations of the positions taken in our article will, so far as we are concerned, close the subject.

Two preliminary observations may be made. To some of our readers it may have seemed that an article upon this subject was a work of supererogation. We certainly wish that it had been so, but since the publication of the article additional evidence has reached us showing that the use of the so-called 'unfermented wine' is increasing. Dr. Kerr also in the lecture on 'Passover Wine' addresses 'the Archbishops, Bishops, and Clergy of the Church of England' in the following terms:—

'This appeal, though before you for little more than a year, h met with a reception far beyond my most sanguine expectatio The force of the argument, the reliability of the evidence, and reasonableness of my request, have not only been widely concec but in a large and increasing number of churches the Incumb have practically responded to my appeal by adopting unintoxic wine either at some or at all of their Communion Services' (p. 4'

adding (p. 25) that his appeal has been 'more widely and more warmly responded to' by some of '"the highest Churchmen" in the country' than by any other.

We may inform our readers that the article was suggested, and has since been approved, by those whose ecclesiastical position and knowledge of the question would, if we were at liberty to mention their names, amply justify the step which was taken with the twofold object of protecting communicants from an innovation at once utterly unauthorized and distressing, and to disengage, so far as we might, the Temperance work in the Church from associations entirely foreign to it, which, if permitted to link themselves with it, might deprive it of large and influential support.

Others may have thought that the tone of the article was unnecessarily severe. We were careful in that article to 'speak with respect of Dr. Kerr's own philanthropic labours' (p. 435), to inform our readers of the fact, which is not stated in his book, that he had read 5,000 volumes 'with reference to the wine question,' adding that 'he is, no doubt, sincerely convinced of the soundness of the conclusions at which he has arrived,' while observations, of which he complains under the head of 'Specific Charge of Borrowing' in his lecture on 'Passover Wine' (p. 5), were neither conceived nor written in any offensive sense. But a few specimens of language used in reference, be it remembered, to an immemorial usage with which the most sacred experiences and memories of devout communicants are associated, shall now be produced, and our readers can then judge for themselves whether or not our language was unnecessarily severe.

Speaking of 'the Sacramental use of a narcotic poison, fraught with peril both to the bodily and Christian life of the reformed drunkard,' Dr. Kerr says (*Wines* &c. p. 126):—

> 'So real is the danger that, Churchman as I am, even when a drinker myself, I never allowed any reformed drunkard to go near a Communion-table where an intoxicating liquid was presented. . . . I would as soon have thought of putting a loaded pistol in the hands of a maniac in a lucid interval, bidding him take care not to shoot himself.'

Again (p. 151) we read the following:—

> 'It ought not to be forgotten that there are large numbers of Band of Hope children who have been truthfully taught that alcohol is a poison. When on joining the Church they are offered intoxicating drink at their first communion, will not their moral sense be shocked? Will they not naturally reason, "Surely what I have been taught about alcohol being a poison, and intoxicating drink poisonous,

must have been utterly untrue. If intoxicating wine is an appropriate emblem of Christ's blood it cannot be poisonous, it cannot be injurious to the body, and it cannot have a tendency to narcotize or paralyse the mind"?'

In *Passover Wine* (p. 27) he returns deliberately to the subject under the heading 'Sphere of Grace,' while 'unequivocally disclaiming any disparagement of "Sacramental grace" or "the grace of God"':—

'As grace does not cut short an attack of continued fever, so it does not protect the whole nature of certain reformed drunkards from being set, as it were, on fire by a draught of intoxicating drink at the table of the Lord, which conflagration has a purely physical origin. I would that it were not so, but my business is to speak the truth, and I can most solemnly assure your lordships, and you, gentlemen, that this physical conflagration is a stern reality which must be met by physical remedy—viz., total abstention from all intoxicating drinks.'

A circular widely distributed in connexion with the sale of 'Wright's Unfermented Wine,' by the Rev. William Reid, D.D., Edinburgh, written some years ago, contains the following passage, as the sequel of a vivid description of the results of drunkenness:—

'And then reflect that there are those who contend that some proportion of the prime agent in this widespread demoralization is essential to a valid observance of the most sacred ordinance of the Church; and that the cup of blessing should contain some proportion of man's worst curse.'

Lastly, the editors of the *Temperance Bible Commentary* speak of

'Exchanging the wine which mocks and deceives for the uncorrupted "fruit of the vine," on which a blessing may be freely invoked without any sense of incongruity, and without exciting aversion and disgust.' . . . 'What God has not joined,' they say, 'may be lawfully sundered whenever a laudable purpose is to be attained'; and while no sacred principle binds the table of the Lord to the vendor of intoxicating and mere fictitious wines, a separation between them would withdraw from that "mystery of iniquity," *the wine trade*, a patronage and implied approval which is simply shocking.' (Second edition, p. 286.)

I. Although Dr. Kerr's pamphlet is entitled *Passover Wine*, only six out of thirty-one closely-printed pages are concerned with that subject, the remainder being occupied by various criticisms on the *Church Quarterly Review*. At the outset we must apologize to Dr. Kerr for one unfortunate oversight, which was certainly careless, but was as certainly

unintentional. It was said (p. 441) that in his remarks upon *Ahsis* our author had omitted to quote Isaiah xlix. 25. This passage *is* mentioned in *Wines, Scriptural and Ecclesiastical.* So far, however, from proving that *Ahsis* was free from intoxicating qualities, the verse very distinctly describes the results of maddening intoxication.

In regard to other charges described by Dr. Kerr in language of which the strength proves the force of our arguments, we may say generally that, in some cases, his knowledge of ecclesiastical history and theology is insufficient to enable him to understand the reasons for our criticism; in others our readers can judge for themselves whether or not these criticisms were well founded. Dr. Kerr's own pamphlet seems to us to supply its own answer. Had we been guilty of the conduct which he ascribes to us, we could not deserve his tribute (p. 29) to 'our sincerity and earnestness,' as well as to 'our ability and learning.' Dr. Kerr complains (p. 10) that we (p. 441) misrepresented his design in the 'Scriptural wine part of his book.' He now informs us that these portions of the first part of the book referring to the original Bible words for 'wine' and 'strong drink,' and to some Biblical texts, were merely tendered as 'suggestions towards the elucidation of some obscure and puzzling passages of Scripture in deference to the critical and theological character of the assembly in the Chapter House of S. Paul's.' We certainly thought that there was *some* object in view in devoting so considerable a part of the book to this kind of critical exegesis. However, we trust that we have done Dr. Kerr no serious wrong, for in *Passover Wine* (p. 29) 'he desires to acknowledge fully the fair and accurate statement we have given of the real object of his book.'

Our author is very angry at the supposition that his erudition is to any considerable extent indebted either to the *Temperance Bible Commentary* or Mr. Scudamore's *Notitia Eucharistica.* It, of course, suits Dr. Kerr to imply that we intended to charge him with dishonourable borrowing, and to talk of 'treating this imputation with the contempt it deserves:' but, as a matter of fact, we spoke of 'his candidly acknowledged solution of the Bible wine question,' referring to the glowing eulogium upon the *Temperance Bible Commentary* with which chapter xvii. of *Wines, Scriptural and Ecclesiastical* is closed. We should also have supposed that chapter iii., on 'The Wine at Cana,' the quotation from Anacreon (p. 70), the decree of Pope Julius I. (p. 137), and Bishop Gobat's testimony (p. 141), with other evidence and exegesis, had been, at least, suggested by the *Temperance Bible*

Commentary, just as the passages from Dionysius Barsalibi, Johannes Belethus, Durandus, and S. Thomas Aquinas may reasonably be supposed to have been originally brought under Dr. Kerr's notice by a perusal of the *Notitia Eucharistica*.[1]

On p. 9 we read 'Curious Charge of Alcohol no Medicine,' with which we may class the section, 'What is Alcohol?' (p. 15). In the former case (p. 444), we had no intention of implying that Dr. Kerr would not prescribe alcoholic liquors under any circumstances; in the latter (p. 448), we were obviously, although not, perhaps, quite accurately, using the term 'alcohol' in the restricted sense of fermented beverages, as we presume is the case in the following passage, which, we think, forms an ample justification of our remarks:—

'There were many alcohols . . . but of the least poisonous, the ethylic, as found in the finest and rarest fermented wine, it could only be said it was an irritant, narcotic poison. It vitiated the blood, inflamed the stomach, overtaxed the heart, destroyed the kidneys, hardened the liver, and softened the brain. It dimmed the intelligence, darkened the judgment, and paralysed the will. The physical effects of alcohol did verily disclose—

"A realm of death! and on this side the grave."'

(Address by Dr. N. Kerr at Exeter Hall, *Church of England Temperance Chronicle*, May 14, 1881.)

We may add that our remarks (pp. 437–439) were simply intended to show that the variety of medical opinion as to the value of alcoholic liquors is so great that their dietetic value is far from being disproved. Whether a pint of pale ale contains 2½ oz. of alcohol, or 1 oz. 12 grs., as Dr. Kerr inform

[1] Compare pp. 883-885 with *Wines*, &c. pp. 137–140. In reference to other criticisms upon our article made in *Passover Wine*, we would point out both to Dr. Kerr and also to those clergymen of whom he speaks (p. 14) as 'not so familiar with other languages, especially Hebrew, as they had been in their undergraduate days,' that Aquinas did not write 'in calice comprimatur' (*Passover Wine*, p. 6), but 'in calicem prematur;' that while 'uvae' (*ib.* p. 6) may sometimes be printed (as it is in the work of Jacobus a Vitriaco) 'vuae,' it is not likely that it was so written by Durandus; if Dr. Kerr intended to offer *facsimiles* of old editions, he should have reproduced 'calicẽ' from the *Summa*. Labbe is not printed with an accent. 'Josh.' is, we believe, given in Webster's *Complete Dictionary of the English Language* as the usual contraction for Joshua, and Joe. for Joseph. We certainly confess that we thought 'Josh. Hall,' like 'Labbe' and the 'Angelican Doctor,' indicated a want of familiarity with the works quoted. προσυφορὰν was a misprint, as Dr. Kerr might have seen. On p. 457 it is printed correctly. We regret the mistake, which, even if it had occurred in *Wines* &c. would have been trifling indeed, compared with Dr. Kerr's translation of προσενέγκατε 'approach.'

us in *Passover Wine* (p. 14), or simply 1 oz.,[1] depends entirely upon the particular kind of pale ale of which an analysis may be made. We did not doubt either Dr. Kerr's veracity or yet the correctness of the Science and Art Department. But we do protest against such names as those of Dr. Andrew Clark, and Sir William Gull being introduced into the question of the use of unfermented wine at Holy Communion on the supposition that they meant to imply that ordinary wine drunk in strict moderation is an irritant, narcotic poison, because they described anhydrous alcohol as such.

For some reason or other, which we cannot explain, Dr. Kerr is sensitive at our description of *Wines* &c. as a 'popular Temperance Handbook' (p. 436). We have only to reply that at the close of his work there is an advertisement in which five other books are described as 'Popular Temperance Handbooks uniform with *Wines, Scriptural and Ecclesiastical.*'[2]

II. Having now disposed of Dr. Kerr's principal criticisms in the text, and of his smaller ones in the notes, we pass to another class of objections made by the Church of England Temperance Society. While we see no reason for withdrawing the criticism which we then ventured to make upon those features of the policy of the Society which appeared

[1] See the report of a case, Leah, appellant, *v.* Minns, respondent, *Daily News*, March 6, 1883.

[2] We do not deal with Dr. Kerr's attempted defence of his arguments based on 1 Cor. xi., the Apocryphal Acts, the Julian Decree, Anacreon, the use of 'Tirosh' in Hosea iv. 11, simply because it is mere trifling to reply to a writer who is unaware of the connexion between the Agape and the Eucharist, the Gnostic character of the Acts and Martyrdom of Matthew, the real nature of the Julian Decree, and the absurdity of imagining that Anacreon meant unfermented grape-juice when he spoke of *οἶνος*, or that an inspired Prophet could possibly class the use of such a fluid with whoredom and intoxication. As 'Timothy's wine' is mixed up in *Wines* &c. (pp. 107-109) with descriptions of the 'grape cure,' 'unfermented wine for a cough,' and an attempt to show that in 1 Tim. iii. 8 *οἶνος* is used for unfermented wine, we think that the inference we drew (p. 449) is not unnatural, although Dr. Kerr does give three extracts about 'medicinal intoxicating wine' as well (*Wines* &c. p. 107). We have nothing to retract in our observations on Dr. Kerr's use of the authority of Professor Ramsay or Mr. Scudamore. We are charged with 'a breach of the ordinary laws of courtesy and just dealing' because we spoke of carelessness in administration of the sacraments being the result of self-constituted ministries. It will, perhaps, be a sufficient reply if we present Dr. Kerr with the following extract: 'The Synod of the Reformed Church of Basle has resolved by a majority of two to one, after long consideration, that Baptism shall no longer be a condition precedent of admission to Holy Communion.' (*Guardian*, March 14, 1883.)

to us open to objection, in regard to 'the Blue Ribbon movement,' and the admission of the 'Scripture Wine Question' with references to the use of unfermented wine in Holy Communion into the pages of the *Chronicle*, we are quite willing to judge the Society, as Canon Ellison desires, 'in a spirit of generous confidence.'[1] We are thankful to accept his assurance that *Wines, Scriptural and Ecclesiastical* has not been on sale at the depôt of the Society, and if we add that we relied upon an advertisement in which the book was so described, we only do so in order to show that we were not writing without some ground to go upon. We can well believe that the Executive Committee of the Society, as Canon Ellison (*Church of England Temperance Chronicle*, February 10, 1873) informs us, have had pressure brought to bear upon them to admit books and tracts bearing upon this question, which, we are glad to learn, have been 'uniformly refused.'[2] But the fact is that in our article we expressly stated that 'we did not suppose that the opinions of Dr. Kerr were likely to be adopted by the Executive Committee of the Church of England Temperance Society in their official capacity.' We did, however, think that these opinions were in one shape or another—for the instances adduced in our article were by no means exhaustive—receiving attention in the *Chronicle*, which would not conduce to the best interests of the Society, and accordingly it is with great satisfaction that in the issue of that paper of March 3, 1883, we read the following paragraph in a letter signed 'Norman Kerr':—

'I am not sorry that I have nothing to thank you and the Committee for, while you have pursued your "warm neutrality" with your warm side to the allies of the Reviewer and your cold side to me. In this matter I care nothing for either total abstinence or moderate drinking, nor for any society or party. Like Hal of the Wynd, I fight for my own hand, and I care not whether you are against me or for me.'

We did not need Dr. Kerr's assurance (*Passover Wine*, p. 12) to make us believe that Canon Ellison was 'honestly opposed to his views on wine.' To have imagined that Canon Ellison approved of them would, indeed, have been inexcusable.

While we do not doubt that both Canon Ellison and the Executive Committee acted with the best intentions in regard

[1] See his letter printed in the *Church of England Temperance Chronicle*, Feb. 10, 1883.

[2] 'So far,' says Dr. Kerr (*Passover Wine*, p. 12), 'from the book being on sale at the Society's depôt, I have received letters from clergymen commenting in strong language at not being able to purchase a copy when on a visit to the central office for other publications.'

to the 'Blue Ribbon' movement, we cannot, in any way, retract the opinions which we expressed in regard to what we must hold to have been an unfortunate mistake. We are quite aware that in his pamphlet on the subject, mentioned by us on p. 467, Canon Ellison has laid down many conditions of co-operation with Dissenters in 'Gospel Temperance Missions' such as, if loyally carried out, would to some slight extent minimize the evils which we fear: but we have no hesitation in saying that the ultimate issue of this and similar combined religious movements must be the increase of indifference in the popular mind to principles which are regarded in the Prayer Book as of the first importance to the growth of the spiritual life; and the Executive Committee of a Society like the Church of England Temperance Society had no right, in its corporate capacity, to act so as to appear to commit the Society as a whole to so-called 'Gospel' teaching to which, in many quarters, the most serious objections are conscientiously entertained. But here, again, we believe that the true remedy is for decided Churchmen to join, as we expressed a hope they would do, in direct Temperance work, and we are glad to note that the *Chronicle* has recently reprinted the following admirable remarks from a sermon preached in the United States by the Bishop of Rochester, we hope and believe as an earnest of a more Church-like line for the future:—

'As to wine, it is the "creature of God," and nothing should prevent us from this testimony, while we find it in His Holy Word deliberately classed by the inspired Songman with His other indisputable gifts of bread and oil; when we remember that our Holy Saviour, pattern and righteousness of His people, not only partook of it Himself, but publicly multiplied it for the use of others; while further we use and accept the language of the Common Prayer Book in the most solemn of her services, where she reverently enjoins it to be consecrated for the use of the saints. I, for one, have no sympathy with those who frown on the temperate use of it; who curtly dogmatize on the physical value of it; who denounce the sellers of it as deliberate manufacturers of wickedness; who hold that the sole remedy for the patent and woeful abuse of it is the Total Abstaining from it by all Christian men. If, as I believe it to be, one great function of the Episcopal Church in this land is to guide, and steady, and regulate, the manifold religious activities in our midst, it is the conspicuous merit and unique claim of this Episcopal Church Temperance Society that her constitution deliberately associates, and on equal terms, for her noble and beneficent work, those who altogether abstain from the use of alcohol and those who, in moderation, partake of it. For it is not only the intemperate who need to be reformed, but the temperate, yet thoughtless, who

need to be instructed and cautioned. . . . But this cannot be done—among those, at least, who are best worth winning and using—by intemperate jargon, or inflated exaggeration, or moral platitudes, still less by rosettes and tea-parties. It is to be effected only by solid argumentation that will bear thinking about next morning, and by calm but kindly persuasiveness by those who, while they properly decline to listen to the fiery advocate who puts a pistol to their heads bidding them stand and deliver, are willing enough, for Christ's sake, to yield to what the judgment of conscience whispers to them, when they see that there is reason behind it.'

We can assure the Executive Committee of the Church of England Temperance Society that so long as they act in the spirit of these words, and of their Chairman's own pamphlet, issued some years since, *Parochial Temperance Work as part of the Cure of Souls*, they may always count upon the cordial goodwill of those Churchmen on whose behalf we write.

III. We add, in conclusion, a few remarks meant, not for Dr. N. Kerr, but for any clergyman who may have felt some uneasiness in consequence of the controversy in regard to the use of wine, in the ordinary accepted sense of the term, in Holy Communion.

In our recent article we endeavoured to show that the only kind of wine mentioned in the New Testament was fermented and intoxicating; that there is the highest moral certainty that Our Lord used such wine in the institution of the Holy Eucharist, because there is no reason for doubting, but, on the contrary, every reason for supposing from His general conformity to established usage, that He would have followed the usual custom; that this certainty is confirmed by the practice of the Apostolic Church as indicated by the events at Corinth and by the clear testimony of the sub-Apostolic and Primitive Fathers; and, finally, that in no age or part of the Church Catholic has any other element than fermented wine in the ordinary acceptation of the term been allowed, except when it was *impossible* to procure such wine. In regard to each and all of these positions we have in our own mind no doubt at all, and although we are perfectly aware that the physical constituents and chemical properties of the bread and wine are not affected by consecration, we still hold that in the faithful use of the Sacrament administered with those elements which 'the Lord hath commanded to be received,' the Redeemer will shield all who worthily communicate from every possible harm. It is not, then, in order to strengthen arguments which, as every competent Biblical and liturgical scholar knows are unanswerable, but merely to

show that we do not speak without adequate authority, that we now subjoin a few testimonies offered by men whose knowledge of the subject is indisputable.

(A) *Passover Wine.* The position of the authors of the *Temperance Bible Commentary,* that the fermented juice of the grape was included in the prohibition of ferment, is given up by Dr. Kerr. 'The evidence,' however, 'seems to him conclusive that by the Jews unfermented unintoxicating wine had been as fully allowed' (*Passover Wine,* p. 18). In order to support this view, he appealed to the Delegate Chief Rabbi, Dr. H. Adler, who addressed to him the following note :—

[Copy] 'Office of the Chief Rabbi,
'16 Finsbury Square,
'London, Jan. 10th, 1883.

'My Dear Dr. Kerr,—I have read with much interest the report on raisin wine, which you were good enough to send me.

'In reply to your question I beg to state that during the Passover Festival the use of fermented and unfermented wine is equally lawful, whether prepared from the grape or from raisin ; but the greatest possible care must be used that there be no admixture of any juice or other substance prepared from corn or grain, whether beer or spirit.

'With kind regards, yours very faithfully,
'(Signed) H. Adler.'

The Delegate Chief Rabbi also attended the meeting, on February 20, at which the lecture entitled 'Passover Wine' was delivered, and gave an address upon the subject, prefacing his remarks by the following statement :—'I confess that I labour under a certain amount of difficulty in referring to the subject, as I have not read the article in the *Church Quarterly.*' We expected that this address would have formed an appendix to Dr. Kerr's lecture, but, as it does not appear there, we must rely upon the report in the *Temperance Record* of February 22, 1883. In this address, then, Dr. H. Adler informs us that

(1) 'The fact is beyond dispute that wine, fermented grape, is not prohibited on the Passover, and the best proof of this matter is given from the *Talmud.*'

(2) 'It was the custom in those days that wine was never partaken of until it had been previously mixed with water, and even the preparation is given in various parts of the *Talmud.*'

(3) 'It is by no means necessary that this wine should have been fermented. Raisin wine was *permissible,* and is still used largely at the present day for reasons of economy.'

(4) 'There are interesting passages in the *Talmud* which earnestly exhort to temperance and denounce intoxication.'[1]

All the support, then, given by Dr. H. Adler to persons who, like the Dean of Carlisle, 1861 (*Wines* &c., p. 110), have no doubt whatever that the cup Our Lord blessed, when He instituted the Holy Supper, was a cup of unfermented wine, is that, in ancient times, 'raisin wine was permissible, and is still largely used for reasons of economy.' The learned Doctor has in effect said very little more than we said ourselves on p. 454, but we venture respectfully to inform him that even this slight admission, so far as the practice of antiquity is concerned, would not be made by authorities whose weight he would, we suppose, acknowledge. Dr. N. Adler is quite distinct in his statement that 'from the notices in the *Talmud* it is apparent that the wine was *invariably* mixed with water, so as to prevent its having an intoxicating effect.'[2] In regard to present usage, Dr. Littledale permits us to state that he 'has been informed by perhaps the most learned Rabbi in England, that great care is taken to preserve the Passover wine from all *extraneous* fermentation, but not from *natural* fermentation, insomuch that *rum* is allowed where wine cannot be had.'

After his address, Dr. H. Adler stated, in answer to a question, that 'the Founder of Christianity, having been a Jew, must have used on the Passover unleavened bread, and either fermented or unfermented wine, the former diluted with water.'

We applied to Dr. Edersheim for information as to the value of this statement, and are allowed to print his reply:—

'Leaving entirely aside the question of the present *use* (which for several reasons is *not* authoritative as to the past, nor determines what it was), I do not know to what passage in the *Talmud* Dr. Adler refers when he says that Our Lord *may* have used either fermented or unfermented wine. The *Jer. Talmud* only speaks, besides ordinary mixed wine, of spiced wine; of wine to which a much larger than the ordinary proportion of water is added, provided only the colour and taste of wine are retained; of boiled wine (*Jer. Pes.* 37 *c*);

[1] Dr. Kerr also cites the testimony of Professor Marks, the head of the Reformed Jewish Church. He states in effect that in that body unfermented wine, prepared from fresh grapes or raisins, is lawful at the Passover. His testimony, however, is valueless in the consideration of the question whether or not unfermented wine was used in Our Lord's day. Dr. Kalisch has said, 'It is unnecessary to speak of Reform (*sic*) Jews, and still less of the Rationalistic Jews, who are Jews only in name and by descent' (quoted by 'Sollicitus,' *Guardian*, September 20, 1882).

[2] See his letter quoted in the *Church Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1883, p. 454.

though it also mentions dried up wine.' 'For my own part I think there can be no reasonable doubt that, according to the general practice, Our Lord and His Apostles on that ever-memorable occasion used the ordinary red wine of the country mixed with water.'

The Rev. S. C. Malan, Vicar of Broadwindsor, in his work on *The Two Holy Sacraments* (p. 119), remarks: 'Likewise was the cup of wine called פרי הגפן, *γέννημα τῆς ἀμπέλου*, "the fruit of the vine," and the best to be had, if possible red,[1] if not, white, also blessed at the beginning of the supper.' While Mr. Malan, whose acquaintance with Jewish customs is well known, thinks it probable that Our Lord at the Last Supper blessed and drank pure wine, he has no doubt that the wine was fermented. 'He must have drunk,' he has written to us, 'either *new* or *old* wine. If *new* of the preceding vintage in September, it must have been fermented (Acts ii. 13) only a few weeks later. If *old*, the wine was, of course, fermented.'[2]

Unfermented wine, then, at the Passover, if anciently used at all, which is extremely doubtful, was employed only in case of scarcity or for economical reasons. The use of fermented wine was clearly general, and where is there the slightest evidence that the wine which Our Lord blessed and drank was any other?

(B) *Church Usage.* No one can seriously pretend that there is any real evidence to show that the Church in the first five centuries ever used aught else in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist than wine mixed with water. We showed in our article that 'The Acts and Martyrdom of Matthew,' and the 'Julian Decree' are worthless; the former is heretical, and the latter spurious. On the part of heretics and schismatics during this period there is no doubt a great deal of affirmative evidence in favour of the use either of grape-juice or water, but we can hardly suppose that 'clergymen of the Church of England who are anxious to follow the exact actions of Our Blessed Lord' in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist would prefer the guidance of 'Bishop Plato,' the Encratites, Marcionites, Hydroparastatæ, and Manicheans, to that of Justin Martyr, S. Irenæus, S. Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, S. Cyprian, S. Chrysostom, S. Augustine, S. Ambrose (*De Sacram.*,

[1] 'I may allude to the fact that red wine was used by preference. It was considered symbolical of joy' (Dr. H. Adler, *The Temperance Record*, February 22, 1883).

[2] We would refer our readers to Mr. Malan's elaborate note 'On the Wine used in the Holy Eucharist' in his work on *The Two Holy Sacraments*, pp. 259–263.

lib. v. cap. 1), the Apostolic Constitutions, and the early liturgies.[1] For ourselves we prefer to be on the side of the orthodox rather than on the side of the schismatics.

In order to make our readers quite certain of the present practice of the Oriental Church we applied for information to the Archimandrite Hieronymus Myriantheus of the Greek Church, S. Sophia, Moscow Road, Bayswater. His reply is quite decisive.

'The holy Eastern Church uses always and everywhere in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist fermented wine, and never unfermented wine. When the priest puts the wine in the chalice he puts also a little water, saying the verse 34, c. 19, of S. John's Gospel. I know,' he adds, 'only by the history that the Abyssinians used wine made from raisins because they had not true wine.'

In this connexion we do not forget that the Copts, like the Abyssinians, have been obliged to use, at times, wine made of raisins with water, instead of the genuine fruit of the vine. The true explanation of the incident is given by Neale in the subjoined extract:—

'The êmir (Mutewakel) seemed determined . . . that the Holy Eucharist should not be celebrated at all. To carry the latter prohibition into the more complete effect, he also forbade, under pretext of extraordinary veneration for the Mahometan law, the buying or selling of wine throughout Egypt, but more especially in Cairo; and so vigilant was the care exercised in the carrying out of the edict that wine was by no means to be procured. In this extremity, the Christians bruised raisins in water, and used the expressed juice to celebrate the Holy Eucharist. A question arose whether the Sacrament thus, in case of necessity, administered with unfermented liquor could be considered valid. Many Canonists denied its validity. Even Egyptian writers do not venture to defend it. So Michael, Bishop of Melicha or Nicopolis, a divine of eminence among the Jacobites, though his age is uncertain, decides that it is not to be allowed.'[2]

[1] Dr. Littledale has kindly informed us that 'no historical Church, except the Armenian, omits the mixture of water (in itself a proof of fermentation), and that Church is charged, when the practice first arose, with sanctioning the omission in the interest of Monophysitism. It is *certain* that the original Armenian liturgy must have had the mixture, because S. Gregory the Illuminator, Apostle of Armenia, came from a Church where the use of the mixed cup is not disputed.' Mr. Malan (on *The Two Holy Sacraments*, p. 269) mentions that the Jacobite Syrians, who are Monophysites, use the unmixed cup.

[2] *Hist. Patr. Alex.*, vol. ii. p. 156. Renaudot, *Oriental Liturgies*, tom. I., p. 193 ff., after discussing this case, and a quotation from Barsalibi, concludes that the use of this grape juice was only allowed 'in extreme necessity,' *i.e.* when it was impossible to procure ordinary wine, and prohibited as a general rule. Among the Christians of S. Thomas, over

The fact is that in citing these exceptional instances to empt to prove their point the advocates of this innovation not understand what they have to make clear. All the es, whether Eastern or Western, cited on their side, are se of the impossibility of procuring *certainly* valid matter, l the consequent licensing of *possibly* valid matter, to ure the celebration somehow. But they have not as yet ved that, when valid matter is procurable, there ever has n licence for any other. The only sort of exception is the ge mentioned by some Western mediæval writers of cele- ting the Mass with juice expressed from ripe grapes on Festival of the Transfiguration. There is in the Greek chologion an office for the benediction of grapes upon this r, and the same usage obtained in many parts of France— at Angers, Tours, Orleans, Auxerre, and Rouen. But to empt to justify the use of unfermented wine in the ordi- y celebration of the Holy Eucharist on the strength of a al French custom observed only once a year simply shows straits to which Dr. Kerr and his friends are driven. We e already shown that S. Thomas Aquinas plainly says that *stum* is only permissible where *vinum vitis* cannot be pro- ed, or *in necessitate*, and we have the high authority of non Bright, kindly given in a private communication, for ling that, in his opinion, S. Thomas 'would not have re- nized any "*necessitas*" except that created by the actual ect of wine commonly so called, and, therefore, that his hority cannot be utilized to cover a Teetotalist proposal to unfermented grape juice in England.'[1]

The judgment of the Roman Church has been courteously plied to us by Bishop Ullathorne.

'It is,' he says, 'of the Catholic faith that Christ instituted the istian sacrifice and sacrament in bread and wine, and that the e in which He instituted the Divine ordinance was the juice of the pe; consequently that no other element but the juice of the grape be used.'

[1] m Barsalibi presided as Metropolitan of Amid, the mixed chalice, lying the use of fermented wine, was and is the rule. (See *The istians of S. Thomas and their Liturgies*, by G. B. Howard, pp. 295, 322, &c.) The use of grape-juice, without plea of necessity, as to have been confined to the Ethiopians, and even this is not im- pably due to Manichean influences, which were strong in different s of Africa.

'Nothing,' Canon Bright adds, 'can better illustrate S. Thomas's tion as to "necessitas" than what he says to the effect that real wine, cient in quantity for the purpose of the Sacrament, may be carried to e countries in which wines do not grow.'

After alluding to S. Thomas, the Bishop proceeds:

'As to the quality of the wine I may quote the general Rubrics of the Roman Missal, authorized by the Pontiffs, and laws of universal obligation. "IV. De Defectu Vini. 1. Si vinum sit factum penitus acetum, vel penitus putridum, vel de uvis acerbis seu non maturis expressum, vel ei admixtum tantum aquæ ut vinum sit corruptum, non conficitur sacramentum. 2. Si vinum cœpit acescere, vel corrumpi, *vel de uvis tunc expressum*, vel non fuerit admixta aqua, vel fuerit admixta aqua rosacea, seu alterius distillationis, conficitur sacramentum, sed conficiens graviter peccat." This includes what S. Thomas says, that "mustum habet speciem vini, sed prohibetur." And from these sentences you will see what is invalid, and what *is* valid but unlawful.'

As Dr. Kerr has produced 'a new witness,' F. Burmann A.D. 1688, one of 'many additional testimonies he could bring forward in proof of the position that fermented intoxicating wine was not the only recognized lawful sacramental element,' we thought it desirable to ask Bishop Ullathorne whether he had reason to suppose that Popes have ever permitted, as Canon Hopkins informs us, the use of milk when wine could not be procured. We quote his reply:—

'I first make the answer that the proposition sounds absurd and ridiculous in Catholic ears. A Pope has no power to change the *materia* of the Sacrament as instituted by Christ, which is bread and wine of the grape, which is the only classical sense of the word *vinum*. What the Popes could not do, they never have done. But the Fourth Concilium Bracarense of the year 675, in its second canon, quotes a decree of Pope Julius I., condemning certain Egyptians for using milk in place of wine in the Eucharistical celebration. It is also quoted in the Decretum Gratiani, but that collection has never been authorized, and the authority for the letter of Julius I. is the citation of the Council of Braga.'[1]

For believing that the unfermented fluids prepared either by the application of enormous heat, and still more of salicylic acid, are not in any true sense wine, we have an authority whose name, if mentioned, would carry very considerable weight.[2] '*There can*,' he writes, 'in my opinion as a chemist, *be no wine unless it be a fermented liquor*.' But, perhaps, some even of Dr. Kerr's audience at the lecture on Passover Wine may have been a little shaken by the following candid admission:—

[1] The Bishop of course regards the decree as genuine, but the force of his general reply is not thereby weakened.

[2] We simply withhold the name because our correspondent tells us that 'time will not allow him to enter into the matter controversially.'

'Nor is it remarkable that the clerical field of vision should have been so contracted when we see a similar limitation in scientific volumes. Take, for example, the most recent of my friend Dr. Wynter Blyth's books, *The Chemistry of Foods.* You will find in that learned and most interesting work, a work of great value and practical usefulness, a definition of wine as the fermented juice of the grape, and a vast amount of reliable information about fermented wine. The existence of unfermented wine is, on the other hand, completely ignored' (p. 21).[1]

If the 'unfermented wines' used for the celebration of the Holy Eucharist in some churches are not wines, then these are invalid matter. If, which we do not believe, they are in some sense wines, still, being unfermented, they are altogether unlawful in a country where real wine can be readily procured; their sanction by authority would expose us to the well-deserved ridicule of all other branches of the Church Catholic, and open serious questions as to the regularity of our own Eucharistic celebrations.

(C) *Appeal on behalf of reformed inebriates.* We have consulted on this subject one of the most eminent of living surgeons. He writes as follows:—

'March 10, 1883.

'My dear——, —I have never seen or heard of any cases in support of the statements which you showed me, and I do not believe that there are any.

'As to the risk that the wine of the Holy Communion may lead the children of dipsomaniacs to the insane practices of their parents, it seems clear that there would be equal risk in entrusting the children of suicidal maniacs with pocket-knives or guns, or any means of self-destruction. Similarly the children of those who steal insanely should not go into shops. If any of the risks were real or appreciable they might be proved by many instances; but I believe that there are none; and certainly they have never been enough to suggest to any reasonable person that all the children of insane people should be shut out from the subjects of their parents' insanity.

'Nearly the same may be said concerning the pretended risk that the Communion wine may induce a relapse in a cured or reformed dipsomaniac. The same risk should forbid anyone who has ever attempted suicide from again handling a knife, or a pistol,

[1] On p. 30 Dr. Kerr admits that 'unfermented wine, unless an antiseptic be added, will not keep many days after the opening of the bottle.' This confirms our view that there is no such thing. 'Long ago,' a very eminent dignitary writes to us, 'some one showed me some such substance, and I said, "Why is it tightly corked up?" "Because," said my friend, "it would ferment." I replied, "Then it would become wine. Is not nature against you if that be so?"' So Dr. Andrew Ure defines 'wine' as 'the fermented juice of the grape.'

or a rope; or anyone who in madness or even mere recklessness has ever done a mischief from ever again being in the opportunity of doing the like. If any of the risks were appreciable the instances in evidence of them would be many and easily adduced. They are, in fact, so few that it would be deemed very unreasonable if, in order to put an end to the risks anyone were to suggest a change in any of even the most ordinary habits of common life.'

Now, premising that we do not cast the slightest doubt upon Dr. Kerr's sincerity, let us enumerate Dr. Kerr's instances of 'relapses through Sacramental wine.'

(1) The case mentioned in *Wines* &c., pp. 123–125, and discussed in our article, pp. 464–5. Dr. Kerr states that he had permission to disclose the name of his *informant* to the late Primate. He would not appear, then, to have had any personal knowledge of the case.

(2) At the lecture on 'Passover Wine,' Surgeon-General C. R. Francis 'attended to relate the history of a recent very remarkable occurrence in a cathedral city, showing the danger to a believing reformed inebriate from an intoxicating cup, even on so solemn an occasion.' In a note, we are informed that 'this case is well known to a Christian worker with whom the Primate is personally acquainted.'

(3) 'Other instances,' says Dr. Kerr, 'are known to me.' He does not mention them, but prefers to present us with the story of a colonel in the Army of the United States (on the authority of 'the eloquent and earnest John B. Gough') who is reported to have fallen and died 'through partaking of intoxicating wine at the Lord's Table.'

(4) Dr. Kerr 'is authorized to disclose to the archbishops the name of a distinguished and learned professor, a non-abstainer, for confirmation of the truth of the relapse of a gentleman, who for years had communicated in unfermented wine at his own church, through a sacramental intoxicant.'

(5) Dr. Kerr states that he refuses 'to allow any of his reformed inebriate patients to communicate in those intoxicating wines in which lurks his inveterate foe.' In *Wines* &c., we learn that 'in this practice Dr. Kerr is supported by Dr. Richardson, Dr. Fergus, Surgeon-General Francis, and other experts in the higher ranks of the medical profession.' We may observe, without offence, that the measure of support is not very large. On the specific instances of relapses we think no comment is needed.

We have no intention of following Dr. Kerr into his remarks on 'the sphere of grace.' We know perfectly well what the scope of the operation of Divine grace is, but we

also know that, while grace cannot repair a physical defect, He Who in His omniscience chose wine in the ordinary accepted use of the term to be with bread 'the outward visible sign of an inward spiritual grace,' said of this Sacrament, 'He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day' (S. John vi. 54). We know also that among the first converts who so received the Eucharist there were men who had been both impure and intemperate (1 Cor. vi. 10), and we shall continue to trust the Redeemer in His own ordinances without supplementing His command by human provisions.

The *Jewish World*, which the advocates of this innovation have thought it fitting to press into their service, although it describes the Sacramental wine as 'the seductive brew'[1] regards the question as absolutely infinitesimal. We suppose that, as the verdict of that journal has been quoted in quarters where better things might reasonably have been expected, some Churchmen think so too. The following extracts, with which we leave the subject, may perhaps show them that the issues of this innovation upon the ancient and general custom of the Church Catholic are not so trifling as they suppose:—

'They say, indeed,' the Bishop of Lincoln has written, 'that we who use fermented wine in the Holy Communion may be right, but that they who use unfermented wine cannot be wrong; as if it were not one of the most wrong things in the world to distract the Church by schism, and to make the Holy Communion, which is the feast of love, to become an occasion of strife.'[2]

The Bishop of Bedford speaks even more seriously:

'That our Blessed Lord used real wine, wine in the ordinary sense of the word, wine such as was capable of being abused by excess, I see no possibility of doubting, and I cannot excuse those who, in the excess of their zeal, incur the peril of condemning the very act and injunction of the Son of God Himself. Their position in the matter has been implicitly condemned by the Church long ages ago, and the plain and obvious sense of Holy Scripture, supported by the practice of the universal Church, is not to be thrust aside by the well-intentioned, but presumptuous, assumptions of enthusiasts of the nineteenth century.'[3]

[1] *Jewish World*, Feb. 23, 1883. [2] *Diocesan Addresses*, A.D. 1876, p. 48.
[3] Sermon at S. Paul's, May 2, 1881.

SHORT NOTICES.

Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the General Epistles of James and John. By JOHN EDWARD HUTHER, Th.D., Pastor at Wittenförden, Schwerin. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1882).

THIS volume, with that on the Epistle to the Hebrews, next to be mentioned, is issued by the publisher uniformly with the volumes of Meyer's *Commentary on the New Testament*, and by way of completing that series where it had been left imperfect by Dr. Meyer. With them, as we learn, the Meyer *Commentary* is complete; and assuredly, however we should venture to differ in not a few particulars from the views on various points expressed in it, we cannot but recognize it as a very valuable one. Dr. Meyer has taken up a crotchet here and there, as, for example, in that curious notion that the group of epistles comprising those to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon were written from Cæsarea, and not, as is commonly believed, from Rome. But usually his mind is wonderfully pellucid and fair, and, so far as we have seen, he never avoids an exegetical difficulty, but frankly states and does his best to solve it. It would be going too far, perhaps, to call him *conservative*, according to the English standard; but according to the German standard he is marked by orthodoxy, and observant of the ancient views which so many of his compatriots altogether disregard. And we do not know *any* German commentary which, upon the whole, we can so unreservedly commend as this.

Dr. Huther's edition of the Epistles of S. James and S. John has something of the same good qualities, though we do not know that it is equal to Meyer's own work. There seems to us to be sometimes a degree of rashness and want of consideration in his comments. This is particularly evident in the introduction to the (first) Epistle. While he rightly attributes it to the pen of S. James, the Bishop of Jerusalem, called the brother of our Lord, he hesitates to identify him with the son of Alphæus (= Clopas), and insists in a particularly rash and violent way upon the truth of the Helvidian hypothesis that the ἀδελφοὶ Ἰησοῦ were 'the children of Mary born in wedlock with Joseph after the birth of Jesus' (p. 7). The conclusive argument for the identity of the two derived from S. Paul's express assertion in Gal. i. 19 he sets aside in a very arbitrary way and without sufficient reason. He does not appear to appreciate the great improbability that there should be two families in each of which there were four sons, and that the cousins in each family should be severally called James, Joses, Jude, and Simon. And whereas most of the critics who hold a similar view do so while allowing the difficulty of it, Dr. Huther

can see no difficulty. He even goes further than other writers who agree with him, and adduces S. Matt. i. 25 and S. Luke ii. 7 as a proof of the irreverent Helvidian view, which is not often done of late. It is arbitrary to say, as Dr. Huther does, that 'if it were otherwise there would be some intimation in the New Testament that Joseph was a widower when he married Mary' (p. 7). Such a remark ignores the essentially *incomplete* and even fragmentary character of the Gospels, considered as a history; for how many material facts are left in doubt in them, *e.g.* the descent of S. Mary, the precise year of our Lord's birth, the number of the Passovers over which His ministry extended, the day on which His death took place, and the exact facts respecting His burial and resurrection! And this makes an argument *a silentio* more than precarious.

The character of this dissertation at the outset does not increase our approval of the book. But we have no specific fault to find with the notes on critical and grammatical points, which are generally satisfactory.

Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Hebrews. By Dr. GOTTLIEB LÜNEMANN, Professor of Theology in the University of Göttingen. (Edinburgh, 1882.)

WHEN we find on the first page of a commentary, as in this, the opening statement that 'the Epistle to the Hebrews is the work of an unknown writer,' we know pretty well what to expect from the commentator. But we could hardly have anticipated the precise conclusion which he has reached upon this subject, and it appears to us the most unlikely possible on a subject which has been fruitful in wild hypothesis. Dr. Lünemann is indeed in one sense (unintentionally) consistent with himself, since he decides for the authorship of Apollos, who is assuredly '*an unknown writer*' to him and everyone else. He seems to us to attenuate unduly the force of the testimonies which ascribe the Epistle to S. Paul, and, in fact, he approaches the question too much in the spirit of a controversialist. There is much exactness and justness of thought generally in the detailed annotations upon the text—*e.g.* on xiii. 11, 'We have an altar.' He follows rightly (in our opinion) the opinion of S. Thomas Aquinas, Estius, with Alford and others, that by it is to be understood 'the Cross of Christ,' on which the sacrifice of the new covenant is offered. It is true that S. Thomas adds 'or Christ Himself,' a fact which Dr. Lünemann does not mention in deciding (as he does) against that opinion. But in negativing strongly that view which explains the phrase 'of the table of the supper,' the τράπεζα Κυρίου, which is the explanation given by Cornelius à Lapide and many other writers, he does not seem to realize how the second of these two conceptions blends with the former one; so that the 'altar' which Christians have may very well have been the Cross of Christ, *formally* and *causally*, and yet, at the same time, the sacrament of the Eucharist, may be mediately and indirectly contemplated. But writers of Dr. Lünemann's school have but little regard for the *perspective* of thought in theology.

The Theological and Philosophical Works of Hermes Trismegistus, Christian Neo-Platonist. Translated from the original Greek, by JOHN DAVID CHAMBERS, M.A., F.S.A. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1882.)

IN the preface to this translation Mr. Chambers gives some account of the legends concerning the person known as Mercurius or Hermes Trismegistus, who represented the learning and sacerdotal discipline of the Egyptians. Some Christian writers supposed him to be prior to the time of Moses, and that he was named 'thrice great Hermes' (*Milton*) from his threefold rank of philosopher, priest, and king. This Hermes was worshipped as a god by the ancient Egyptians.

The author of the *Poemandres* cannot, however, claim such high antiquity. Casaubon and others have shown that he was a Greek living at Alexandria, of later date than Philo.

There have been several editions of the *Poemandres* produced on the Continent, but the treatise has received but little notice in England. The Greek text and Latin and French translations have appeared from time to time. The *Poemandres* and the *Fragments* collected by Stobæus are ascribed to the same author; not so the other Hermaica, which are either of Egyptian heathenish origin (p. xvi) or belong to the later times of Plotinus and Jamblichus.

The style of the *Poemandres* is mystical and obscure. It follows the Platonic notions of God and the generation of the universe. The author was evidently acquainted with the Old Testament Scriptures, and the Book of Wisdom, and the writings of Philo. The first part takes the form of a dialogue between the philosopher and the Mind of the Supreme Power concerning the origin of things. The Archetypal Mind, which is male-female,[1] begets life and light, and then by the word or Logos becomes the cause or parent of the creative intelligence. Hence there are generated the seven administrators.

God is the First Cause of all. Man is the child of God, with a twofold nature. To the heavenly and Divine part of man there is ascribed will, immortality, and dominion; to the inferior part, which is material and moves in the region of sense, there is ascribed energy, mortality, and subjection to fate. Nature in man, as well as other things possessed of life, is originally male-female, but is subsequently separated into sexes.

There is an ascent of the soul of man out of the region of sense to seek its Divine Parent. The holy and good among men detest the senses; the sensual and carnal give themselves over to death instead of mounting upwards.

[1] ἀρσενόθηλυς. This may be compared with the doctrines of the Kabbala. See an article on Adolphe Franck's treatise, *Christian Remembrancer*, April 1862, p. 352: 'There are notices of a belief in a male and female principle as pervading the Deity. The shekinah is spoken of as female; and the three elements of water, air, and fire are "mothers."' The system of emanation is Persian or Indian, but the idea of the male and female principle was borrowed from the Egyptian mysteries.

The distinctive attribute of God most dwelt upon is His paternity. He is also the Cause of all, and the only good. The souls that partake of the gift of God elevate themselves above the bodily pleasures, and hasten to the One and Only, considering their sojourn here as a misfortune. Hence asceticism is praised, such as was practised by the Essenes, according to Josephus, and is ascribed by some to the author of the Book of Wisdom when he speaks of the corruptible body pressing down the soul. 'The garment which thou bearest is a web of ignorance, the support of wickedness, the bond of corruption, the dark enclosure, the living death, the sentient corpse, the tomb carried about with thee, the domestic robber, who hates through the things he loves and grudges through the things he hates' (p. 46). With this the translator compares some expressions of William Law in his *Spirit of Prayer*. 'Our own life is to be hated, and the reason is plain: it is because there is nothing lovely in it. It is a legion of evil, a monstrous birth of the serpent, the world, and the flesh. It is an apostasy from the life and power of God in the soul; a life that is death to heaven, that is pure unmixed idolatry, that lives wholly to self and not to God; and therefore all this own life is to be hated, all this self is to be denied and mortified, if the nature, spirit, tempers, and inclinations of Christ are to be brought to life in us.'

On the other hand paternity is declared to be so Divine and essential to happiness and completeness that it is the greatest misfortune and irreligion that anyone should depart childless from among men. This assertion comes as a strange episode in a Platonic treatise, and is in direct contradiction of the teaching of the Books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, especially Ecclus. xvi. 1–3. The author, however, quotes Wisdom, as in v. 5: 'I wish it were possible for thee, becoming winged, to fly up into the air, and being lifted up in the midst between the earth and heaven, to behold the solidity of the earth and the fluidity of the sea, the flowings of rivers, the looseness of the air, the vehemence of fire, the course of stars, the very swift circling of heaven around these.' This, with the passage which follows, is an expansion of Wisdom vii. 17–19, where wisdom is said to include the whole circle of knowledge, the perception of the 'things that exist.' In chapter x. there is another point of contact with wisdom. 'Hast thou not heard in the Generics that from the one Soul of the universe all souls proceed, which are rolled about as if distributed in all the world?' as in Wisdom the Divine Sophia is said to 'go through all understanding, pure and most subtil spirits.' Impious souls suffer the flames of their own impiety, but it is an error to suppose that they enter into wild beasts. The heavenly bodies, and all things that have motion, are regarded as animated by a soul (p. 71). Life is the union of mind and soul. Death is not the destruction of the compounds, but the dissolution of the union (p. 73).

The translation is followed by an appendix, consisting of a few extracts from the Fathers which contain notices of Hermes or quotations from his writings. Amongst these are extracts from Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Cyprian, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Augustine.

The writers who made most use of Hermes were Lactantius and Cyril of Alexandria. Among English divines William Law was the most attracted by his mysticism, as he was at another time by the strange fancies of Jacob Boehmen. In his *Appeal to all that doubt the Truths of the Gospel* he says, 'It has been an opinion commonly received, without any foundation in the light of nature or Scripture, that God created the whole visible world, and all things in it, out of nothing. Nay, that the souls of men and the highest orders of beings were created in the same manner. The Scripture is very decisive against this original of the souls of men. For the soul came forth as a breath of life out of the mouth of God. It is no more a part or prerogative of God's omnipotence to create a being out of nothing than to make a thing to be without any quality of being in it,' &c. The Platonic notion that the world was generated rather than created is prominent throughout Hermes.

The translation appears to be careful and accurate, and the reader is much helped by the Greek of the more obscure words being given in foot notes. In some places it is needlessly bald and literal, but the translator has brought together a good deal of curious matter in illustration of his difficult and somewhat unattractive subject.

A Religious Encyclopædia; or, Dictionary of Biblical, Historical, Doctrinal, and Practical Theology. Based on the *Real-Encyclopädie* of Herzog, Plitt, and Hauck. Edited by PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D., Professor in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. Volume I. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1883.)

HERZOG'S *Real-Encyclopädie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche* was begun as long ago as 1854, nearly thirty years ago, and in those days was a good deal sought after, being then almost the only representative of a very useful class of work, from which much information might be gained, particularly upon the subjects of critico-philosophical thought and Biblical criticism. It long remained almost without a rival in these respects, for such inquirers, at all events, as were able to read German; and if an English edition of it, under adequate English editorship, had been issued fifteen or even ten years ago, it would have had the field to itself. But since then Smith's *Dictionaries of Christian Antiquities* and *Christian Biography* have appeared, a series in some respects unrivalled in excellence; and so we cannot tell what the probabilities of success of this edition may be. They would, however, we should imagine, be the better for a somewhat closer adaptation to English literary standards on the part of the editors. The number of headings is indeed enormously large; but very many of the articles are so brief as not to answer any purpose beyond directing the inquirer to some other book. What can be the intention of a life of 'Antoninus Pius' in twenty lines (we should have chosen to give his full name, 'T. Ælius Hadrianus Antoninus,' at least once in a biographical article; but we are perhaps pedantic and old-fashioned in our ideas of the necessity to be accurate, at all events in an encyclopædia), or of Pope Agatho in nineteen,

of Basilides in thirty-four, of Domitian in thirty-seven? Such articles should either be excised altogether or made adequate. Again, 'Chaucer' only occupies a column, 'Charlemagne' a column and a half, while 'Channing' has nearly double this length. This seems to argue a somewhat peculiar estimate of the relative importance of persons. To compensate this want of fulness in detail it must be added that the articles cover a much wider range than is usual in a cyclopædia of religion, and that its comprehensiveness approaches that of a general or universal cyclopædia. In adopting this line, however, it seems to us that more is attempted than can possibly be accomplished within the limits apparently marked out for the work. But there are, of course, many good and able articles, well conceived, and sufficient in length for a satisfactory unfolding of their subject. Such are 'Agnosticism,' 'Church History,' 'Congregationalism in England and in the United States' (two articles), 'Cuneiform Inscriptions.' 'College,' curiously enough, is wholly occupied with American institutions, and has nothing to say about Oxford and Cambridge and other institutions on this side of the water. In fact, the work so far seems intended to be the beginning of an encyclopædia which shall take as its special department things American—a very laudable purpose, which may eventually bear good fruit.

To our English eyes many *little* things seem amiss. There is a certain crudeness of expression, arising no doubt from the fact that many of the articles are translations from the German. It is odd to find 'apocryphical' for 'apocryphal' (p. 14), 'Aimon' for 'Aimoin' (p. 10); 'God must lessen His pace if He would keep step with man' (! !) (p. 20); and again, 'in token of the Lord's sincerity' (! !) (p. 16). The brief article on 'Absolution' (it is only thirty lines) is rather inexact. 'Chasuble' is defined as 'an ecclesiastical garment.' The article 'Clergy' is drawn on the extremest Protestant lines, and begins with the words, 'It may be considered settled that there is no order of clergy, in the modern sense of the term, in the New Testament; *i.e.* there is no class of men mentioned to whom spiritual functions exclusively belonged. Every believer is a priest unto God. Every believer has as much right as anybody else to pray, to preach, to baptize, to administer Communion.' An alarming exordium indeed!

A History of the Councils of the Church, from the Original Documents. By the Right Rev. Charles Joseph Hefele, D.D., Bishop of Rothenburg. Vol. III. A.D. 431 to A.D. 451. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1883.)

This third volume of the excellent English edition of Bishop Hefele's *Conciliengeschichte* appears at a considerable interval, but will be found exceedingly interesting. Twenty years more important than the precise twenty which it covers have never passed even in the varied history of the Church. They comprehend the two great Œcumenical Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, with the preceding and following synods, of which there were several both in the East and West, which were occupied with the Nestorian and Eutychian

controversies, and with the bitter personal quarrels which inflamed the doctrinal questions. Great interest is given to Dr. Hefele's narrative by the care and particularity with which he follows the great councils from day to day and from session to session. At the same time it is not to be forgotten that he holds a standing brief for the interests of the Papacy. He invariably takes the lofty claims which the legates of the Popes were at all times commissioned to put forth as the simple expression of their rights, and every courteous word with which such claims were received as an express acknowledgment of their justice. The editor of these volumes has very rightly directed express attention to Bishop Hefele's persistent attempts to break the force of the 28th canon of Chalcedon. It is amusing to observe that he repeats the statement of the Ballerini that the Roman See has never expressly recognized that canon, even while his instincts of historical correctness induce him to add, 'This must, however, be limited by the fact that' the fourth Lateran Synod under Pope Innocent III., in 1215, *did* so recognize it—a very important limitation. It is indeed only on Ultramontane principles that the Pope can be thought to be superior to an unambiguous canon of an Œcumenical Council of undoubted orthodoxy, and Bishop Hefele has not usually been thought a very thoroughgoing Ultramontane. No doubt a diplomatic form of speech had its advantages.

We can recommend this work to any who may not know it as able, learned, and more comprehensive than any other of its kind.

A Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects, and Doctrines during the First Eight Centuries. Being a continuation of the *Dictionary of the Bible.* Edited by WILLIAM SMITH, D.C.L., LL.D., and HENRY WACE, B.D., D.D. Vol. III. Hermogenes–Myensis. (London : John Murray, 1882.)

THIS is a substantial instalment of a really valuable work. In previous notices of the earlier volumes of the series we have several times expressed our high appreciation of the service rendered to the scholar, the student, and the divine in the publication of these Dictionaries; and we need therefore say little more on the general character of the series. The present volume is as good as its predecessors, and of a very similar character, though longer than any of them, containing as it does more than a thousand pages. It comprises, perhaps, an unusual number of important articles, marked by great ability and learning, and each of which is the fruit of sufficient research to have made a volume, instead of being compressed into an article, however lengthy. Such are Dr. Cazenove's monographs on the two Hilarys, him of Poictiers and his greater namesake at Tours; Dr. Swete's on the 'Doctrine of the Holy Ghost;' Mr. Gore on 'Leo the Great;' Dr. Salmon on 'Montanism' and 'Muratorian Fragment;' and especially Dr. Badger's valuable history (for it is nothing less) of 'Muhámmad.' Very good also is Mr. J. H. Lupton's 'John of Damascus,' and especially praiseworthy for a *catalogue raisonné* of the works of the great Eastern

doctor. The author does not write as if he had examined the originals very closely for himself, but his article is probably the best account of them extant in the English language.

Mr. Mozley's 'Libanius' is generously appreciative of the pagan rhetorician and opponent of Christianity, a praise which we fear we cannot extend to the article on 'Hieronymus' (Jerome), the author of which can hardly be said to be very enthusiastic about his subject. Nevertheless he is careful and painstaking, and estimates S. Jerome very justly on literary grounds. It is strange that so great a writer should have laid himself open to the charge which his biographer makes with too much of truth. 'In theology, properly so called, he is weak.' Nevertheless his style is rugged and forcible, for which his biographer renders him due praise, adding that 'it is vivid, full of illustrations, with happy turns, such as 'lucus a non lucendo,' Ὀνῷ λύρα, 'fac de necessitate virtutem,' 'Ingemuit totus orbis et Arianum se esse miratus est.' And the assertion is perfectly accurate. But we cannot understand why, when instances of this '*sal Atticum*' might be picked out of S. Jerome's writings by the score, the writer of the article should hit upon sayings for quotation which were not peculiar to S. Jerome at all, but which he employed as the mere conversational coin current in society.

The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit: the Ninth Series of the Cunningham Lectures. By GEORGE SMEATON, D.D., Professor of Exegetical Theology, New College, Edinburgh. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1882.)

A SATISFACTORY treatise on this subject has long been one of the chief *desiderata* of theological literature. Dr. Smeaton's book, good as it is in some respects, hardly professes to supply the want. It 'has taken shape . . . . rather as a general survey of theology from the view-point of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit than as an exhaustive exposition of any single topic.' This diffusiveness is the primary fault of the volume before us. Whilst no branch of the great subject has been overlooked, none is quite adequately handled. This is partly due, no doubt, to the form in which the work is cast. But though a lecturer is not at liberty to overload his text with details, he may supplement it with extensive footnotes and appendices—a privilege which our author has not permitted himself to use. There are also minor defects of execution which detract from the value of this volume. The style wants crispness and variety; it presents an unbroken expanse of evenly balanced periods, into which one longs to interpolate occasional valleys or hills. And, with no prejudice against the use of theological terms in a professedly theological treatise, we fail to see that either the theology or the English is helped by such expressions as 'rejuvenating,' 'sopited,' 'rectoral display,' 'glozing seduction.' Nor should we have thought it necessary to characterize David as 'the subordinate under-king of a Divine theocracy.' Akin to the employment of ambitious language is the writer's habit of overstating his case, as when he says that in Heb. ix. 14 the Eternal Spirit 'can only mean' the Holy Ghost, or

that the conviction of righteousness 'must mean' the giving of convincing evidence of the doctrine of an imputed righteousness.

In his manner of handling the sacred text Prof. Smeaton is not always fortunate. 'The Lord God and His Spirit hath sent Me' (Isa. xlviii. 16) can hardly, without violence to the Hebrew and the LXX, be converted into 'The Lord God hath sent Me and His Spirit.' In S. John x. 35 Our Lord is far from representing 'the word of God and the Scripture as identical,' the former being in this place the Divine call which preceded and accompanied the writing of the sacred books. In 1 S. Peter iii. 18 it is surely precarious either to retain the received text against the authority of all the uncials, or to translate πνεύματι in such a manner as to destroy the antithesis to the preceding σαρκί. And we must be permitted to express our surprise that a professor of exegetical theology should have supported an assertion of the plenary inspiration of the Apostles by appealing to 1 Thess. iv. 8, without intimating that the inference falls to the ground if the reading of all the critical editions (εἰς ὑμᾶς) is accepted.

A yet graver fault is the narrowness of the writer's theology, which, rigidly orthodox from a Presbyterian standpoint, is impatient of the fuller and profounder views of truths which are the heritage of the Catholic Church. Prof. Smeaton has read the Fathers and studied Church history, and when the verdict of the Ancient Church is at one with the Westminster Confession he accepts it cheerfully; but if the Fathers differ from Calvin and from the Puritan divines, so much the worse for the Fathers. We fear we must add that under similar circumstances the natural interpretation of Holy Scripture has to make way for one which is strained or impossible. Our author's πρῶτον ψεῦδος is the theory of indefectible grace, and it is curious to observe how he manipulates passages which interfere with this favourite dogma. *E.g.* on S. John iii. 5 he writes (p. 170), 'The water to which the Lord refers certainly regenerates, and entitles those who receive it to enter the kingdom of God, from which no true member can ever be cast out again—which cannot be affirmed of baptism in every case. . . . The water referred to by our Lord in this connection was but the ceremonial expression for the cleansing of our persons by His own obedience or atoning sacrifice. . . . The water and the Spirit . . . . are the two conjoined elements; in other words, the meritorious cause and the efficient cause.' Still more remarkable is his way of escape from 'the two difficult passages which involve the apostacy of some professing Christians after being made partakers of the Holy Ghost ([Heb.] vi. 4), and where the parties have done despite to the Spirit of grace (x. 29).' They are 'instances of men receiving only the supernatural gifts, not true grace.' And this although the persons in question had been 'once for all (ἅπαξ) enlightened,' and 'sanctified' by 'the Blood of the covenant'!

We must also take exception to our author's practice of representing at a disadvantage the position of his antagonists, whilst he exaggerates the excellences of his friends. Thus Archbishop Laud is condemned for having by his influence introduced and encouraged

Romish practices in the English Church; and on the same page we read that the 'platonic mind' of Howe 'soared to the contemplation of the beatific vision.' In the 'spirituality' of the Puritans the writer can 'find nothing false or unhealthy;' their opponents, it is implied, regarded 'the Spirit's work . . . . as merely coeval and identical with the rite of baptism.' 'Ritualism, Romish or Anglican, agrees in making the Church's action a substitute for the action of Christ and His Spirit . . . . it entirely ignores the operation of the Spirit of God . . . . it makes the ever-acting High Priest a mere inactive spectator, and is irrespective of the Spirit's grace . . . . the whole transaction is lodged in other hands.' But such *ex parte* statements are perhaps no more than might have been expected in a book which opens with these amazing words: 'Except where Puritan influences are still at work, we may safely affirm that the doctrine of the Spirit is almost entirely ignored.'

Notwithstanding these blemishes there is much in this book which may be thankfully welcomed. It begins with a useful *catena* of Scriptural evidence; it states the Catholic doctrines of the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, the Deity and Procession of the Holy Ghost with a fulness and precision which generally leave little to be desired; and it presents a historical survey of the doctrine of the Spirit which is of considerable interest and fairly complete. Here and there the reader will find suggestions which may strike him as happy and fresh, and we would call attention in particular to the remarks on Christian ethics viewed in the light of the Holy Spirit's sanctifying work. Upon the doctrine of the Procession, it may be added, Prof. Smeaton is entirely at one with the Western Church; and whilst he offers no apology for the insertion of the *Filioque* in the Creed, he is disposed to attribute the comparative stagnation of Eastern Christianity to the loss of the truth which the interpolation represents.

On the whole we regard this book as a useful stepping-stone to the full and dispassionate treatment of a most important subject; and we rise from its perusal with the hope that it may provoke to emulation some English Churchman of loving and reverent faith, wide reading, and deep sympathy with the mysteries of the spiritual life. A Church which has given birth to the theological works of Hooker and Pearson, Bull and Waterland, Newman and Pusey, and whose prayers, as Prof. Smeaton reminds us, are 'replete with allusions to the Spirit's work and mission,' seems to be qualified in no mean degree for the task of collecting into a comprehensive and permanent form all that the thought and the experience of Christendom have contributed to the exposition of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost.

Confession and Absolution in the Bible. By the Rev. WARWICK ELWIN, M.A. (London: J. T. Hayes, 1883.)

CONTROVERSIES and differences of opinion on the value of private confession will, we suppose, never cease in the Church; and certainly until they do books on the subject will continue to be written. To the number of these Mr. Elwin has added one that has the merit of

taking a line which seems to have been strangely neglected. His work 'is intended to differ from other treatises on the subject chiefly in a more definite recognition of the historical development of penance by revelation, and in a fuller and more connected study of its evidences in the successive books of the Bible.' Accordingly the bulk of the book is devoted to an examination of Holy Scripture; and the thoroughness and candour with which the investigation of what is really taught on the subject in God's written word is conducted deserve the highest praise, and will, we cannot doubt, be found most helpful in dispelling prejudices and bringing home to the minds of many the need of *definiteness* in their repentance. There is so much ignorance and vagueness on this point, springing, we fear, sometimes from loose and random treatment by the clergy, that anything which may help to force upon men the need of *real* sorrow for sin, and of *real* confession of it, cannot afford to be neglected; and consequently we are truly grateful to Mr. Elwin for his well-timed essay.

The following passage will indicate the method of the book, and the manner in which the endeavour is made to bring out the continuity and progressive character of the teaching of Scripture:—

'The Bible evidence to be examined naturally falls into four great eras, each marked by its own characteristic revelation and its advancing development of the doctrine. First, there was the Primeval, extending from the Fall to the Flood. Its characteristic teaching was the elementary principle of repentance in its threefold form, particular emphasis being laid upon the confession to God. Then came the Patriarchal, extending from the Flood to the time of Moses. In this period there was added the idea of human mediation and intercession, the germ of the sacerdotal ministry. Thirdly, there was the Mosaic period, covering all the time from the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai to the beginning of the Christian dispensation. Ritual confession and typical atonement by means of animal sacrifices were the special features of this important era. Lastly, there was the Christian epoch, comprising our Lord's own ministry upon earth and that of the Apostles to the close of the canon of Scripture. The great crowning revelation of the New Testament teaching upon repentance is the gift to the Church of an effective ministerial absolution. Thus, by a steady development, the doctrine of penance was brought to the final state in which it has become the heritage of the Christian Church, to administer to penitent sinners until her Lord comes again to ratify and complete her work' (p. 31).

The main interest and value of the book of course lie in that part which is concerned with our Lord's teaching on the subject. To this three chapters are devoted (x.–xii.), entitled 'The Ministry of our Lord,' 'The Teaching of the Absolving Ministry,' and 'The Commission to Remit and Retain.' The nature of the power to 'bind and loose' in S. Matthew xvi. 19, xviii. 18, is carefully investigated, and Mr. Elwin sums up in favour of the view that it may well include both the meanings attributed to it, viz. that of forbidding and allowing *things*, and excommunicating and pardoning *persons*, both senses of the phrase being amply supported by quotations from the Talmud and Rabbinical authorities. The discussion of S. John xx. 19–23, which stands next, is perhaps the best part of the whole work. More than

half a dozen different explanations, or evasions, of the passage are examined separately and rejected as inadequate; and it is then convincingly shown that nothing short of a real power of absolution (operative as well as declarative) will satisfy the requirements of the terms used by our Lord; and those of our readers who know how widely the late Dean Stanley's volume on *Christian Institutions* has been read will acknowledge that plain and careful teaching on this head is as needful now as it ever was. A chapter on the Acts and Epistles concludes this part of the work, to which is appended the longest chapter in the volume, with the somewhat misleading title of 'Controversies on Penance,' misleading we say, because the chapter is devoted to a scholastic discussion of various questions which arise naturally out of the subject as already treated, rather than to any historical account of those controversies which have actually agitated the Church. Still the chapter is useful, and contains an examination of some points of considerable importance, although we think that the value of the book might have been increased had the historical method been followed.

We cannot conclude without drawing attention to the list of authorities and treatises on penance which is found at the end of the volume. This seems on the whole tolerably complete, but contains no mention of the very interesting *Treatise on Penitential Confession of Sin* published anonymously in 1657, but *written* several years earlier. This work is referred to by Marshall in the preface to his *Penitential Discipline* (p. xiv. A.C. Lib.), and, though copies of it are very rare, it is still in existence, little as it appears to be generally known at the present day. It seems a pity that a work so curious and interesting should not be more accessible to the general public. Will not some enterprising person or society take the hint and give the world a new edition of it?

The Ultimatum of Pessimism. An Ethical Study. By JAMES WILLIAM BARLOW, Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Dublin. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, and Co., 1882.)

THE admirable qualities of Mr. Barlow's thought and style convert a subject which is not only very tough but also very unpalatable into a logical treat. An unpleasant subject it is, but eminently worthy of attention. Those who are only acquainted with pessimism as a gloomy or cynical temper, know nothing of the depths of that doctrine at all. This is but temperamental pessimism, which Mr. Barlow classifies under its three heads—of the wrathful, the despairing, and the grumbling—only that he may dismiss it as a mere affair of humour, totally different from that elaborate system of thought which forms the real subject of his study.

The true theory of pessimism is the work not only of reasoners, but of reasoners who, if you but grant their premisses, can scarce be reasoned against. Only concede that intelligence is a mere function of the brain, and what follows. In the first place, the idea of God as an intelligent existence separate from the world, departs, and in the next place, the idea of human life continued after the bodily organs

are dissolved, vanishes too. The originating power which gives the impulse to life becomes a something (if it be not too much to call it a thing) to which it is impossible to attribute any character, or even any individuality. The laws by which it works are only to be discovered by registering the order of evolution. And what then does our observation of evolution teach us? Does it present us with a progress in happiness which we may hope will lead in the future to the elimination of all disorder and pain? Such is the pleasant result which some derive from their observation of the world. But not so Schopenhauer, Hartmann, and their followers. To them it seems that every advance in the order of evolution is an advance in pain. Will is developed with increasing distinctness and power, first in the lower animals, and then, in a supreme degree, in man. And will implies a want of present harmony between the organism and its environment. For if the organism were in absolute agreement with what surrounds it, what would be left to will? At the same time intelligence develops; and what is intelligence but the obligation to reflect and the inability to lose the consciousness of self in our surroundings as a lower creature can do. So far from happiness growing as culture grows, the very reverse is the case. Culture involves decrease of happiness. And the true prescription for our sorrow is *Wiederverthierung*; that is to say, a return to the condition of beasts. This, however, we cannot effect. We are committed to a terrible progress, without respite and without hope.

This is a view of things which may easily be laughed aside. But the reader has but to peruse the summary of pessimistic argument which Mr. Barlow gives in order to see that the system is much more easily laughed at than refuted. Perhaps most men have seen enough of suffering in the world to know that if we set aside, in the first place, all expectation of a world beyond the present, and in the second all those illusions as to the joy which this world has to give, with which the weak encourage themselves, but which advancing intelligence must perforce dissolve, a case may be made for the essential misery of the system of the universe which is startling indeed. In fact the argument is so extremely formidable that its strongest refutation lies in its own completeness. It is a tremendous *reductio ad absurdum* of human life. One does not understand why a man who has once thoroughly accepted it permits himself to live an hour longer than the period which may be necessary to arrange for the benevolent murder of all for whose happiness he cares. Far less can one understand how any pessimist who professes any tinge of morality can commit the monstrous crime of propagating a race which is doomed but to grow in misery.

It is absolutely necessary for pessimists to give some reply to this. No system would have much chance of acceptance which involved the reasonable obligation of suicide and of childlessness; moreover it is a matter of fact that pessimists continue to live and marry, and they cannot allow that their practice is in contradiction to their principles. The answer to the question why a miserable race should live and multiply, when the power of self-extinction rests

in their own hands, is the ultimatum of pessimism. The various steps by which it is reached will be found in Mr. Barlow's book. But the conclusion is as follows: The conception of God having been rejected, there remains in the place which He used to fill, the Absolute, otherwise called the Transcendental, Being. Now, to conceive of this Being (if the word Being may be used) as happy, and creating for the increase of his happiness a race so miserable as ours, is to attribute to him a revolting selfishness which would utterly unfit him for our love or service. But if we conceive of him as miserable, and all the pain and suffering of the world as the effort of his misery to work itself off, then we cannot but feel a sympathy with him, and a desire to aid his weary work of self-relief. It is for this purpose that we must endure the burden of life and hand it over to others.

But it seems to us that there is hardly sufficient force in this motive to restrain the most self-sacrificing pessimist from the happy despatch; much less does it suffice to warrant him in imposing the immolation of a deadly life upon descendants who, as further advanced in evolution, will taste still more of its wretchedness than he is fitted to feel. To subject living and conscious beings to actual and tangible pain for the sake of an Absolute to which we cannot attribute even existence, not to say capacity for pain, save in a transcendental sense, is more than any religion has demanded, especially as the Absolute only attains individuality and consciousness in us, and can therefore hardly be understood to derive anything but misery from our misery. Moreover, we cannot know anything of the wants or desires of this Absolute Being except through the wants and desires which the conscious beings in whom he attains reality and individuality may develop: and if in the course of culture we are to be brought to a desire for non-existence, it is impossible to say why we should not regard that as the expression of the mind of the Absolute just as much as the absurd desire for existence which the uncultured display. Perhaps the Absolute may require our extinction, and in persisting to live we may be baulking him in an effort to relieve his pain. If we are, in Von Hartmann's own words, to regard the universe as 'a painful drawing poultice which the All One Being applies to himself in order first to draw out an inward pain to the surface, and then to hinder it for the future,' who shall say but that the extinction of conscious life as fast as it reaches the stage of evolution at which it comprehends its own misery may be the bursting of the blister and the sign that the patient is cured?

The reply which Mr. Barlow with great force urges to this monstrous system is this: that in order to reach your Absolute and act on a motive of sympathy for him, you must quite plainly pass out of the region of fact and experience into transcendental regions. Now, the impossibility of making this passage is the very ground on which you have previously rejected the idea of a future life. Why may not a future existence then be the answer to the question, how we can make life worth living? In the possibilities of the future life we may find the solution of the miseries of the present and the reconciliation

of culture and happiness. A future life may be reached not only with as little difficulty as that which has been experienced in attaining to the belief in a suffering Absolute, but even with far less. For the future life requires only a certain arrangement of atoms which in actual fact has already taken place. A mathematician endowed with sufficient knowledge might calculate the period at which the atoms will again in their ceaseless change and evolution produce a life which, taking up the memories of the present, just as one moment of our present takes up the memories of the past, might properly be called a renewal of our present existence.

This seems to be true. No one who realizes the wonderful fact that this life has actually been somehow or other evolved can deny that a future life may be evolved in the same way too; but men refuse to accept any future wonder, exactly as if the present had brought to pass no wonders at all. In fact, so evident a physical possibility is the future life that it hardly deserves to be called a transcendental conception. It is rather a natural extension of our observations upon actual facts.

But we have some doubt whether the future life *alone*, even if it could be made more probable than upon the theory of evolution we can well suppose it to be, would suffice to fill the gap. It might indeed show suicide to be useless; although a man might with apparent reason destroy his life even with the prospect that the course of evolution might bring it into renewed being. He might hope that that time would be distant, and intend when it came to destroy himself again if he finds things as bad then as now. But unless we had some reason to think that the future life will be happier than the present, it would at least be plainly insufficient to justify the propagation of the race. And the bare idea of a future life does not warrant any expectation that it will be happier than the present; growing misery in the present might give good ground for apprehension that the future would be worse still, and some one indeed has lately revived the horrible conception (which Jean Paul propounds as a dream) of an atheistic immortality of despair impossible to put away. We therefore feel disposed to wish that Mr. Barlow had urged upon the pessimist not the mere idea of a future life, but the idea of God in the first place, and secondarily of a future life derived from Him, as filling up the gap which must be filled if the continuance of existence is to be anything better than an absurdity. The existence of God requires certainly no greater effort to reach than does the suffering Absolute. It has the advantage, which the other altogether wants, of a universal tradition of mankind in its favour. Nor does it necessarily involve the notion of a happy being creating a miserable race, since a God may have such good things in store for the race as will entirely deprive it of the title miserable.

We are also inclined to question the complete justice of Mr. Barlow's remarks upon the value of argument from analogy. He believes that in the hands of Butler it did good service for a time, but is highly dangerous against our present enemies. It is hard to see how it can ever have done really good service unless it be founded

in truth. But Mr. Barlow appears to us to confound the general idea of argument from analogy with the particular application of it which Butler urged. It is certain that the assumption of the existence of an author of nature which Butler makes is not fitted for times in which to attain the belief in a God at all seems often harder than it is to accept the whole Christian system after once you have come to believe in Him, or for dealing with people who consider nature so bad that resemblance to her dealings with us would be an objection more than a recommendation. Yet Butler's argument, even as it stands, begins to have some force for anyone who entertains the notion even of an unknowable source of life. Even the perverse parody upon the belief and service of God which is found in the theory that we are to endure a miserable life to relieve the pain of the Absolute, gives ground for an argument of no slight force by which it might be shown that the principles on which you base this belief and this endurance can never find their real and complete application except in the form of belief in a suffering Saviour and the endurance of the cross for His sake.

But even were we to concede that the particular analogy which Butler urged has lost its force, that does not condemn the argument from analogy in general. It only compels us to urge it from another position. Butler argued that the submission which we all render to God as the author of nature requires by analogy submission to religion. We, on the other hand, must leave God out of our assumption, but we may still argue that the submission which men render to nature and her laws requires of them by analogy submission to faith in God and to religion. In fact Mr. Barlow's own reply to the pessimists appears to us to be a very able example of analogical reasoning, 'You believe in sympathy with a miserable Absolute; if you think yourself at liberty to use the faculties by which such a conception may be reached, you should by analogy feel much more at liberty to exert them so as to believe in a future life.' We commend this extremely suggestive book to the attention of the thoughtful reader.

The Dead Hand in the 'Free Churches,' with Pictures of their Inner Life, sketched by eminent Nonconformists. Edited by the Author of *The Englishman's Brief on behalf of his National Church.* (London: Walter Smith, late Mozley, 1882.)

THIS powerful exposure of the two main pretences of modern Dissenting communities—that they are free internally and free externally—has reminded us of the trenchant letters on the *Voluntary System* which were published by the Rev. S. R. Maitland in 1834, and appeared in a second edition in 1837. With that bright and keen pen, which pricked not a few imposing wind-bags in its time, the scholarly Librarian of Lambeth revealed to his contemporaries the light which shone in the midst of the 'Dark Ages,' and exhibited the bondage and compulsoriness which lay hidden within the 'Voluntary System.' His method in both cases was the same. He was singularly free from viewiness and the conjectural *à priori*

habit of stating a case. He cited the monastic chroniclers of the Middle Ages and the Dissenting preachers and politicians of the first three decades of our century to speak for themselves, standing aside himself, and simply calling attention to their words. Hence his *Voluntary System*, which will be found to be still a most readable book, was an unanswerable attack upon Dissent conducted wholly by Dissenters. The long Latin word 'Voluntary,' in accordance with the modern change of fashion, has made way for the English word 'Free,' and in place of the 'Voluntary System' of Messrs. Burder, Pye Smith, Wilks, and J. A. James we have the same thing generalized as the 'Free Churches' by Dr. Allon, Mr. J. G. Rogers, and Mr. J. A. James's successor, Mr. R. W. Dale. The author, or compiler, of the *Dead Hand* has followed Maitland's precedent, with some slight difference in form and manner. The title 'Nonconformists' had not come into fashion in Maitland's time. He and his witnesses always use the more correct and historical title of 'Dissenters.' The new work is cast into the form of a dialogue between two friends, the Rev. Septimus Saywell, Vicar of Kingsford, and the Rev. Richard Riversdale, minister of an Independent chapel in Kingsford. We doubt if this form is the fittest for a controversial argument. The reader knows from the first that the victory is predetermined for one of the interlocutors; and this knowledge is not unlikely to raise some prejudice in a *fair* mind on behalf of the interlocutor who is destined to be beaten. Perhaps the very best work of this character, Bishop Patrick's *Friendly Debate between a Conformist and a Nonconformist*, loses by being cast into this form. The slight tincture of story given to the *Dead Hand* by its dialogue form may, however, attract and hold some readers, in spite of the fact which becomes so evident in the first chapter that the Rev. Mr. Riversdale is not really a Dissenter at heart. Every strong thing which is said for or against Dissent throughout the volume is spoken by some well-known living Dissenter, and is usually extracted from reports of the *Congregational Year-Book*, or from the columns of the *Nonconformist and Independent*, or other Dissenting newspaper. The general character of the argument of the *Dead Hand* may be described as a sustained and incontrovertible *tu quoque*. The older Dissent was theological and ecclesiastical: it assumed that the Church of England was 'unscriptural' in her doctrine and 'antichristian' in her constitution and discipline. The modern Dissent has departed from these traditions of its fathers and founders: the theology of Laud and Jeremy Taylor, or of Berkeley and Tillotson, must seem much more liberal and less terrible to the educated modern Dissenter than the theology of Owen, or Gill, or Joseph Hart, or of the trust deeds of his own chapel. Hence the difference between the Church and Dissent is shifted to a new ground. The Church is said to be internally and externally enslaved, whereas the Dissenting 'Churches' are internally and externally 'free.' The author of the *Dead Hand* remorselessly tears in pieces this baseless pretence, or rather stands aside and shows us the strange sight of eminent and representative Dissenters, such as

Messrs. Dale, Rogers, Allon, Stoughton, Conder, Parker, and a host of others, tearing it in pieces in sight of the world. His demonstration that Dissent, by its own confessions, possesses neither the inward nor outward freedom of which it publicly boasts is almost cruel in its severity. But the process is carried out by the demonstrator without a particle of bitterness; everything bitter, cruel, or damaging throughout the book is said by some well-known living Dissenter or quoted from the Dissenting journals of 1881 and 1882. The Dissenters again and again complain in these pages that they have no genuine internal freedom of self-development in the direction of any new light which may have dawned upon their pastors, that they have no liberty to follow out the new convictions or tastes which may spring up in the bosom of the 'voluntary churches,' because the pastors and churches are bound hard and fast by a rigid 'creed,' formulated in the trust deeds of the chapel. They are not even free to appeal to Holy Scripture against the doctrines of the trust deed. As to external freedom, in respect of independence from State patronage and control, the case is equally bad. The Independents alone have no fewer than two thousand chapels 'strictly tied up,' as a Dissenting newspaper complains, 'to be used only by ministers who hold the opinions set forth in the Deed by zealous but ignorant founders.' 'At this moment,' complains Mr. Baldwin Brown, 'many of the most eminent of our ministers are preaching under trust deeds containing statements of doctrine which nothing would induce them to utter from their pulpits.' If any 'free church,' or any member of a 'free church,' should contend that the minister is eating Calvinist bread while he is preaching anti-Calvinist doctrine, and quarrel should arise as to his title to his benefice, by whom must the question be settled? By the State. The contending parties must carry their quarrel before 'Cæsar,' if an English civil court be Cæsar. The secular power must examine the doctrine or creed of the 'free' and 'independent' church, and decide whether the minister is a conformist or nonconformist to the trust deed. If the State should decide against him, and he should nevertheless assert his liberty to preach in that chapel, he must be ejected by the secular arm. These points are brought out with great completeness of evidence—all the witnesses being typical Dissenters—in the thirty-one chapters of this vigorous and lively book. The argument is not a very high one; for it merely says to the Liberationist who sneers at the bondage of the Church, 'Dissent is just as much in bondage.' Nor is it a very deep one; for it does not strike at the theological and moral root of Dissent, which may yet produce other and worse growths than Independency, Anabaptism, or Methodism. But it has its use, and ought to be widely read. It will be especially valuable to anyone who is engaged in the defence of the Church of England against those attacks which are made upon her from the political side.

Œuvres Inédites de Bossuet découvertes et publiées, par A. L. MÉNARD. Tome 1, Le cours complet sur Juvénal. 8vo. (Paris : Didot et Cie. 1882.)

THE volume which we introduce to our readers is the first of a series which is designed to comprise the *inédites* works of Bossuet ; it was discovered by M. Ménard in an old building near the ruins of the Château de Richelieu, together with some other MSS., and certainly deserved to be published, both on account of the celebrated prelate who was responsible for it, and of the pupil for whose instruction it was composed.

Three years ago, M. Ménard, in a pamphlet now partly reproduced, brought under the notice of the literary world the discovery he had made of Bossuet's papers ; very naturally suspicions were excited and doubts expressed as to the authenticity of the MSS. in question. The scandal created by the forged documents sold to M. Chasles was still in everyone's recollection, and the feeling which greeted the alleged restoration of important literary treasures was invariably, at first, one of scepticism. In this case, however, no doubt was possible, and from the thoroughly sifting examination to which the two volumes purchased by M. Ménard have been subjected, we may boldly assert that we are now in possession of a portion of the prelate's works hitherto unknown, and unusually interesting because it is connected with his duties as tutor to the Dauphin.

We are all aware that, assisted by the Duc de Montausier, and Huet, Bishop of Avranches, Bossuet undertook the arduous task of training a child who seemed of the most ungovernable and wayward disposition. The course of instruction devised for that purpose included, as might well be supposed, a study of the classical authors of antiquity, and the volume now before us gives us the text of Juvenal with philological, historical, and moral remarks by the prelate. If the work had possessed a merely literary interest, we should not have noticed it in this journal, but we think that it is curious to see the lengths to which hero-worship can be carried. M. Ménard is extremely proud of having discovered some unpublished MSS. of Bossuet, and he feels anxious to make the most of his good luck ; but would anyone imagine *à priori* that the tutor of the Dauphin, the proud controversialist, the enemy of Protestantism, the champion of absolute power, the author of the *Politique tirée des propres paroles de l'Ecriture-Sainte*, becomes, in M. Ménard's preface, a quasi-freethinker, a democrat, a forerunner of Diderot and Voltaire? The following passage is one of the most amusing specimens of prejudice that we have seen for a long time :—

'The last Father of the Church (such is the title given to Bossuet by La Bruyère) is, after all, nothing else than a dilettante of all poetry and of eloquence, and the profane splendour of his lectures (on Juvenal), as learned as it is artistic, thus identifying the successor of S. Thomas with the rival of Demosthenes, the illustrious Bossuet will now throw off for posterity the absolute clericalism (?) of his traditional physiognomy. No doubt he extols inflexibly those hierarchies which bear the consecration of centuries (and not unreasonably, for we have seen to what an abyss

utopias can lead us); but he also celebrates with a feeling of earnestness, even under the roof of the Louvre, the true *Liberty*, *Equality*, and *Fraternity*, long before the three magic words had been inscribed on the ruins of the Tuileries.'

We fancy some of the French radical *littérateurs* of the present day taking up M. Ménard's volume and asking whether the man so pompously celebrated in the preface is really the Bossuet who pronounced the funeral oration of Chancellor Le Tellier, who disgraced himself by his persecution of Fénelon and Madame Guyon, and who represented the principle of absolutism in the pulpit as Louis XIV. did on the throne. We grant most readily that the word *Liberty* appears frequently in his numerous writings, but it is the *Liberty* 'wherewith Christ made us free,' and it is a matter of doubt whether the admirers of M. Jules Ferry would be ready to endorse *that*. We likewise acknowledge unhesitatingly that Bossuet repeatedly alludes to the doctrine of *equality*, but it is the equality implied in the passage 'for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God:' and would not M. Gambetta have called this arrant clericalism?

If M. About, M. Sarcey, and the other critics quoted by M. Ménard, really admire the ethical doctrines inculcated by the 'Eagle of Meaux' as a comment on Juvenal's satires, we can only congratulate these gentlemen on their good taste; but we must remind them at the same time that the tutor of the Dauphin, whilst stating over and over again in the plainest possible language that kings, magistrates, and rulers, are established in authority for the good of their subjects, would certainly not have sanctioned an appeal on the part of the people against the abuses and crimes which are the almost infallible results of despotic power. Finally, if we object to M. Ménard's novel portrait of Bossuet, we thank him most warmly, on the other hand, for the care with which he has prepared and published this valuable and elegant volume.

Le Positivisme et la Science Expérimentale. Par M. L'Abbé de Broglie. (Paris: Victor Palmé, 1881.)

Reviewers are presumed to have an extended general acquaintance with the literature of the subject treated in any great work which they criticize; or, if they cannot lay claim to such knowledge, at the least to have thoroughly mastered the work itself. In the case before us we feel bound to confess, not only that our comprehension of many of the questions at issue is far less complete than we could desire, but that we have not yet read every page of the two handsome volumes of large octavo which the Abbé de Broglie has published.

If it be asked how under such circumstances we venture to bring the book before the notice of our readers, our reply must be that we have expended a considerable amount of thought and study upon the themes discussed in these volumes; and further, that our examination of them has proceeded so far as to enable us with the utmost confidence to recommend them to that public which our voice can reach, as a most truly valuable and thorough contribution towards

the understanding and elucidation of at least one of the most important problems of our age. It is true that M. de Broglie's native country may be regarded as the home of Positivism. Still not only has M. Comte a large following in England, not only has his philosophy left a deep impression on the works of Grote, Mill, Buckle, and others, who would have shrunk perhaps from calling themselves entirely his disciples, but we must also take into account certain tendencies of British thought, both during our own and an earlier generation, if we would appreciate the needfulness of grappling with the teachings directly and indirectly springing out of Comtism. Even a glance at the pages now before us serves to show how frequently M. de Broglie is compelled to invite attention to English authors. They appear sometimes as allies, more or less in unison with his own modes of procedure, still more often as adversaries whose speculations must be contravened, if we are to be sincere and consistent in the profession, we do not say of Christianity, but even of a true and real Theism.

For it is Theism and nothing more which M. de Broglie assumes throughout as the basis of his reasonings. An able French critic of the book, M. Paul Janet, has justly observed that it contains nothing which can be objected to on theological grounds by any reader who is a Theist. We proceed, so far as it can be managed within our scanty limits of space, to set forth the main problem of these volumes.

The general outlines of Positivism have been well described by Archbishop Thomson in a lecture delivered at Edinburgh in 1868. He explained to his audience how this modern claimant to the title of a philosophy maintained that all knowledge was to be summed up in experience of facts acquired by the senses; that for the terms 'cause and effect' we ought to substitute 'invariable succession;' that the supposed distinction between essential and accidental qualities of objects must henceforth be banished alike from our phraseology and from our thoughts; that our apparent knowledge of things was only the knowledge of their relation to us—the knowledge, in short, of our own sensations; and that as the triumphal march of mechanism, chemistry, and physical science in general during the last century has been made through the means of the microscope, the spectrum analysis, and so forth, we must look to similar inductions as the sole means of progress in the realm of mental and of social science.

M. de Broglie's account of Positivism is substantially identical with this. Nor indeed do we suppose that the accounts of the matter drawn up by friendly hands, such as those of Mr. Mill Mr. Grote, would be found to present any serious items of differen But both Archbishop Thomson and the Abbé de Broglie proceed point out the rarity, to say the least, of such a phenomenon a tolerably consistent Positivist. In the words of Dr. Thoms 'Comte, and Littré, and Paine, and Renan slide into lang which, if true to their instinct, is false to their philosophy. speak of type and aim and ideal. They let back into the unawares the doctrine of a purpose in creation, of a though guides it!'

Now, one main object of the volumes before us is to show not merely that Positivists are inconsistent, but that they must necessarily be so. To this end is sought the aid of logic, of grammar, above all of that experimental science on which Positivism professes to take its stand. Nor is our author content with mere negations. He aims at the bolder and nobler task of supplying us with a system of philosophical creed in relation to the questions of our time, though not by any means of our time alone.

We have not space at present for anything like an *exposé* of this creed. It may, however, be safely described as taking its start from that common-sense philosophy of Reid, and of his allies of that Scottish school which made so great an impression on the France of fifty years since. But though starting thence, our author is conscious that this school laid too great stress on the unanalysed *primâ facie* convictions of the untrained intellect; and accordingly M. de Broglie attempts a modification in this respect of the Scoto-Gallican position. So far as this objection is concerned, he might have cited in support of it the language of his illustrious countryman, the late M. Victor Cousin. In his preface to his book entitled *Philosophie Ecossaise* (we quote from the third edition), M. Cousin, amidst his praises of the Caledonian school of metaphysics, declares that 'l'excellence de cette école écossaise n'empêche pas qu'elle n'ait ses défauts. Satisfaite du sens commun, elle s'y repose, et ne sent guère le besoin de pénétrer dans les profondeurs de la vérité.'

When, as is here the case, we thoroughly sympathize alike with the premises and the practical conclusions, with the whole aim and tone of a writer, it seems desirable to find out, if possible, from what quarter difficulties and objections may arise. We take up accordingly for the moment the position of an advocate of what we regard as in the main the wrong side. The work before us takes its first stand, as we have said, upon the basis of common sense. But the author, having seen the failure of a school that rested too exclusively upon the *data* thus furnished, seeks to establish principles and lay down rules for our guidance in the determination of the question, where we are to be content with the decision of common sense, and where we may legitimately make appeal as it were to a higher court, to the trained and cultivated reason. It may very probably arise from the circumstance that we have not yet mastered all the critical apparatus provided for us by the Abbé de Broglie, but we do not feel sure that we are yet in possession of any criteria sufficient to enable us to solve this very considerable primary difficulty.

Illustrations of our meaning may be easily supplied, and that from what may seem to many an unlikely quarter. It is from mathematical science that we take the first that occurs to us.

The schoolboy, who learns in his *Euclid* that it is of the essence of parallel lines that they should never meet, may very possibly jump to the conclusion that all other lines except parallel ones must, if produced in both directions, ultimately meet somewhere. It is surely startling to him to find, if he proceeds in due course to the study of conic sections, that there are lines (as for example the

ordinate and the curve of the equilateral hyperbola) which may be produced *ad infinitum*, and yet, though constantly approximating, never meet. It is hardly too much to say that average common sense—such at least is our experience—obstinately declines to believe this truth. It has never grasped the conception of a real line—length without any breadth. We cannot exhibit these non-coincidents (or *asymptotes* as they are commonly called) to the actual eye. Hence the untrained intellect demands why it is to be called to give up its common-sense conclusion of disbelief. If it does so in this case, why not then in any other? What limit is to be placed to credulity? Why must it accept the authority of the mathematician?

We might turn to other provinces of mathematics; for instance to the newly discovered *quaternions* invented by Sir William Rowan Hamilton. But for variety's sake let us glance for a moment at a page of the other Sir William Hamilton, the Scotch metaphysician, in whom M. Cousin recognized the most advanced pioneer of the common-sense school of mental science. Speaking of the possible position of the thinking principle, Hamilton writes: 'Some (and their opinion is not, certainly, the least philosophical) hold that in relation to the body, the soul is less contained than containing—that it is all in the whole and all in every part.' ('Lectures on Metaphysics,' Vol. I., Appendix 4.) And not to multiply illustrations, we will content ourselves with citing once again the well-known words of the hard-headed and sceptical David Hume: 'No priestly dogma ever shocked common sense so much as the infinite divisibility of matter with its consequences.' In such problems as the position of the soul and the nature of matter, how far is the voice of common sense to be listened to? Where are the limitations and why are they to be insisted on? If, as is really possible, a prolonged study of the work before us even helps us on the road to a mastery of this difficulty, it will be one additional cause of gratitude to our author.

We might say much on the relation of the philosophy of the Abbé de Broglie to that of Hegel, and to that of M. Taine and Mr. Herbert Spencer; names which are prominent in his pages. But at present we confine ourselves to one general practical impression.

From America (witness the sermons of Mr. Phillips Brooks), from the testimony of thoughtful observers in England, and now from the evidence of the Abbé de Broglie as regards France, we learn that scepticism, rather than pronounced unbelief, is the mental epidemic of the day. Now, practically M. de Broglie seems to give us advice remarkably consonant with that contained in the pages of the eloquent American preacher, of Mr. Justice Fitzjames Stephen, and of an excellent discourse recently published by Dr. Liddon. M. de Broglie remarks that scepticism is harder to grapple with than a pronounced system of unbelief or misbelief. But he bids us take comfort. No man is a sceptic all round. Let us try to arrest his downward course at some point where he does feel himself to be on firm and solid ground. Start, for instance (with S. Augustine), from a man's admission of his own consciousness of identity. 'I

am I' carries him who admits it a great deal further than he may see at a glance. 'I am that I, who has done much that is wrong.' 'I am that I who cannot even imagine myself ceasing to exist.' We do not seek for the moment to press these principles further. But every thoughtful mind must see how much further they can be legitimately pressed. We may possibly be able to recur to the subject.

Meanwhile we heartily thank the Abbé de Broglie for his clear, well-arranged, lucid exposition of his case. Admirers of his family assert, that for the last three centuries it has always supplied to France an Admiral, a Marshal, or a Prime Minister. Our author, leaving to his brother the Duc de Broglie the study of history and the domain of politics, was, if we mistake not, in earlier years an officer of the Royal or Imperial Navy. In changing his profession he has joined that considerable list of men of eminence in secular pursuits who have trodden in the path of such saints as a Cyprian and a Hilary of Poitiers, and brought into the ministry many valuable gifts which have been won from secular pursuits. That a son of his father and a grandson of Madame de Staël should unite a taste for abstract reasoning with the power of clear and graceful expression is a natural heritage. But his studies for scientific seamanship have given him a real and lively acquaintance with the physical science of his age; and the Honorary Canon of Evreux and of Paris has trained himself for the chair of Christian Apologetics which he now occupies by working assiduously as the *Ancien Elève de l'Ecole Polytechnique.* Many of his countrymen and friends, who had hoped to see him hoist the national flag on board the vessel of an Admiral, may live to confess that Prince Paul de Broglie is doing as good service for France, amidst seas with tempests and dangers of their own, in what the world regards as the more humble career of his new sphere of really exalted and self-denying duty.

A communication made by Dr. Andrew Clark to the Derby Church Congress (which will be found in the *Guardian* of October 11, 1882) may be referred to here, because, as coming from a man of science, it forms a striking and instructive comment upon a line of thought which appears from M. de Broglie's book to be very common in France as well as in Great Britain. Physicists say to theologians: 'You see *we* state certainties; *you* are constantly inflicting on men's minds mere theories, which do not admit of any sort of verification.' Dr. Clark's summary of the counter-position sets forth such important positions as the following:—

> 'That there is nothing absolute in the whole objective world; no absolute standard of mass, quality, or duration; and that the knowledge of an absolute primitive weight of atoms is impossible. . . . That the assumption, constituting the fundamental axiom of modern physics, that true explanations of natural phenomena are mechanical, is incompatible with demonstrated facts. . . . That there is no law of physics, not even the law of gravitation, without great and growing exceptions. . . . That therefore the boasted accuracy and permanence of so-called

hysical laws and theories is unfounded ; that very probably the greater art of the so-called axioms of modern physics will be swept away as ntenable ; . . . and that after all there may be methods of spiritual verification which within their condition, scope, and use, may compare not unfavourably with the methods so confidently depended upon in physical research.'

Règlement donné par la Duchesse de Liancourt à la Princesse de Marsillac; avec une notice sur la Duchesse de Liancourt. Par LA MARQUISE DE FORBIN D'OPPÈDE. (Paris : Plon, 1881.)

BIOGRAPHY forms the best supplement to history, and in the charming little sketch before us every thoughtful reader will recognize one of those 'lives' which were to France the very 'salt of the earth,' preserving her in the darkest times of her social life from utter corruption. The title scarcely describes the work, for the notice, placed first, and merely intended as an editorial introduction, occupies half the book, and forms its most interesting section. The '*Règlement*' is a rule of life, in the style of S. François de Sales, but written by a seventeenth-century grandmother to her granddaughter, both standing high in the brilliant Court circles from Henri IV. to Louis XIV. The '*Règlement*,' edited by an Abbé Boileau—not the brother of the poet—was first printed in 1694, twenty years after the untimely death of her for whom it was written. A century later, the second edition appeared on the eve of the Revolution, only to be thrown aside and lost, till sent forth under the present able and appreciative editorship.

Jeanne, Duchesse de Liancourt, was the only daughter of Henri, Maréchal Schomberg. Statesman and soldier, in spite of his mass of public business, he found time to give to his little Jeanne '*une éducation sérieuse et forte.*' And further, in a quotation from Abbé Boileau, we have some details of her occupations under her father :

Comme il lui trouva beaucoup d'ouverture d'esprit, il lui donna quelque connaissance des plus grandes affaires, lui faisant lire des négociations et des traités, lui dictant des dépêches, et lui en faisant faire pour l'exercer.'

What would our modern damsels say to such 'schoolroom work'? It may be well for those who think that women are now educated to a pitch of usefulness never before attained, to weigh well the Marquise de Forbin's description of a great lady's duties, in an age when public life early absorbed all the men :

'. . . Tandis que leurs maris, retenus loin du foyer par la vie militaire et les charges de cour, ne demandaient à leurs intendants que de fournir à leurs dépenses ; c'était ordinairement sur elles que retombait le fardeau des affaires. Les femmes visitaient les terres, administraient les biens comptaient avec les fermiers, signaient les baux et les conventions, e avaient la haute main sur l'éducation des enfans.'

A wide sphere truly, and that Jeanne was equal to it all we can doubt, as we mark in her instructions to her grandchild the sound advice given on all these important topics ; she herself having wi

administered her husband's immense wealth, when his own extravagance threatened to impair their fortunes.

Mademoiselle de Schomberg was destined to the heir of the Duc de Sully, but on the disgrace of that family, her father tried to force her into a marriage with the son of the Duc de Brissac, a youth unpleasing in mind and person. In spite of her attachment elsewhere, and her tears and despair, the Maréchal stood firm, and the ceremony took place in 1618, to be annulled by the Church immediately afterwards, on the ground of want of mutual consent. 'On les démaria,' and Jeanne gave heart and hand to Roger du Plessis Liancourt. Her wifely devotion and many virtues succeeded, after long years, in winning him from a life of selfish extravagance and licentiousness; and she retained her sway over him until her death. Their only son, Henri Roger, made an unhappy marriage with Elizabeth de Lannoy, and fell in the trenches at Mardyck, leaving his posthumous daughter, Jeanne Charlotte, to his mother's care. Round this infant all her hope and joy circled; strongly Jansenist in her sympathies, the little one became at five years old a pupil of the Mère Angélique, though a strong desire for the convent was steadily discouraged. She was married to the Prince de Marsillac, but died early, leaving infant children, and her death seems to have broken Jeanne de Liancourt's strong and tender heart; she only survived her granddaughter a few weeks.

Not the least interesting feature in the memoir is the short but masterly sketch of Jansenism and the Port-Royalists. The De Liancourts formed part of the brilliant constellation of nobles that gathered round the school of Arnauld, De Sacy, and other leaders, numbering the Princesse de Longueville, the Marquise de Sablé, the Duc de Luynes, and many others in its ranks. The Marquise de Forbin seizes well on the weak point in Jansenism, the tendency to a dogmatic sectarianism, estranging itself from the corporate life of the Church:

'Le Catholique se contente de préférer telle doctrine à telle autre, telle pratique pieuse à telle autre, sans rien exclure de ce que l'Eglise admet. Le sectaire n'a qu'un point de vue. Tout ce qui n'entre pas dans le cadre qu'il s'est tracé n'existe pas à ses yeux, ou, s'il existe, doit être retranché, sinon condamné. C'est ainsi que cédant chaque jour davantage à l'esprit sectaire, Port-Royal en vint à s'infliger de cruels démentis.'

Of the '*Règlement*' which forms the subject of the book we need not say much; it must be read to be appreciated. There is scarcely a womanly duty, public or private, on which some valuable precept is not given, all based on the highest and purest principles of Christian life as drawn from the Gospels. The practical commonsense is a distinguishing mark of the whole; as when she directs a young mother never to suffer her son to be coerced in the matter of a profession or her daughter into convent-life, or either into a repulsive marriage. Was she thinking of the cruel blight that had threatened her own young life? The Marquise de Forbin furnishes an interesting parallel by placing in foot-notes selections from the code given a century earlier by Anne de France to her daughter Suzanne

de Bourbon. Most readers will agree with her that there is at least a century in improvement, culture, and knowledge of the world between Louis the Eleventh's Anne de France and the Court-lady of Anne of Austria. Here and there, both these good women unconsciously lift a veil, showing a glimpse of social manners so corrupt, that a woman living in its midst, and keeping her heart with all diligence, was indeed an evidence of that strength which is perfected in our weakness.

The last twenty pages contain '*Le Règlement que Madame de Liancourt avait dressé pour elle-même.*' She who taught another had well taught herself. When we read the rules by which this remarkable woman guided her life in the closet and the Court, we number her among those whom a husband's heart can safely trust, whose children rise up and call them blessed.

Such a record of such a character is too valuable to be a mere literary curiosity; and we think that the Marquise de Forbin has rendered a service to her sex in thus placing before them the life and mind of Jeanne, Duchesse de Liancourt.

The Official Year-Book of the Church of England. (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1883.)

THIS book is designed to meet what has long been felt to be a great want. Work of all kinds is being carried on in the Church, but when accurate information concerning it is required, it is very difficult to obtain. For many years the various bodies of Nonconformists have issued their 'Year-Books,' in which all that it is thought desirable should be known concerning their respective denominations is chronicled. Not so the Church of England. It seemed as if those charged with the administration of her affairs were afraid of letting the world know what was being done, or as if they dreaded a punishment like that inflicted upon King David for numbering the people if they ventured to place on record the deeds of piety performed by Churchmen. So far as we can trace, the errors in this volume are chiefly on the side of omission. And for the first year or two of the existence of such a summary of work this is only to be expected. At first information is obtained with difficulty and after great labour, and is comparatively incomplete. Each year fills up one or more gaps; and so in time, if care is given, the desired completeness is secured. The editor has divided the work of the Church under a series of heads or chapters. In the first of these he tells of the organizations, general and diocesan, for assisting candidates for holy orders who need pecuniary help; of the theological colleges in which they may be educated; of the examinations they will have to undergo, with the report of a committee of the Northern Convocation on the diaconate and the requirements for fulfilling that office; and of certain spiritual exercises which have been employed for quickening and elevating the religious life of the clergy. The second chapter deals with the home mission work of the Church under a variety of heads, which we need not enumerate. Then we have chapters on the educational work of the Church; its foreign missions; the

increase of the episcopate at home and in the colonies, with some account of what has been done and is doing to secure the requisite funds for endowing other sees; choral associations; the councils of the Church, including in that very wide word not only the two Convocations, but Church congresses, conferences, &c. &c. Beside these we have a chapter containing reports of Churches in communion with the Church of England; one on clergy charities, endowments, &c.; another with a list of ordinations, preferments, and obituary of the year, the latter embracing a short account of the more distinguished clergy who have died during the year; then another chapter containing a chronological record of events; and after that a chapter with the names of many of the more important contributions to Church literature, ranged under various heads; after which there are more than a hundred pages of 'statistical records.'

But we should be uncandid if we stopped here. The present volume will be useful, but we think it might be made much more useful. The editor seems to us not to have quite grasped the ideal after which his book should be fashioned. An 'Official Year-Book' should aim to place the facts with which it deals in a very clear and condensed form, and to avoid all temptations to amplify and improve the occasion. Moreover everything contained in the book should be in a form capable of being quoted; an 'Official Year-Book' should be rather a quarry, in which others may find the materials they require for building, than a finished building. Again, we have, in juxtaposition, two sets of reports, which show exactly the kind of information which we think the *Official Year-Book* of the Church ought to give and ought not to give. The first is the report of the two Convocations. Clearly and concisely it tells exactly what subjects were discussed, and what conclusions were arrived at; and though the proceedings of the Southern Convocation lasted for eight days, and there were two houses to be reported, and those of the Northern Convocation lasted for three days, fifteen pages suffice to tell all that needs to be told. But when we turn to the Church Congress at Derby, where no conclusions could be arrived at, and though it lasted only four days, we find more than fifteen pages occupied with a *précis* of the papers read and some of the speeches delivered. So, too, with Chapter XII., on recent Church literature. It fills twenty-six pages, is almost necessarily very imperfect, and the descriptions of books are too short to be of any practical value, and must very often be only misleading. We have taken these as examples; we hope that another year will see the excision of all such useless matter. The only other point to which we would call attention is the unsystematic arrangement of the information given and consequent want of perspicuity in bringing out prominent facts. It seems to us that the statistical portion of such a book is its most important feature. Each chapter, therefore, should be headed by a clear, definite summary, wherever possible in tabular form, of what is being done. Take as an example what is said of lay readers. It is of far more importance to have a statement of the number employed in each diocese than to have the forms by which

they are to apply for a licence, and by which that licence is given. Then, again, the chapter on Church extension should have been ushered in with the tabular statement of the number of churches consecrated in each diocese.

We thank the editor (the Rev. F. Burnside) for his share of the work, and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge for undertaking the venture, and we confidently look forward to great practical advantage to the Church from such a publication.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS, NEW EDITIONS, SERMONS, ETC.

The Charge of the Archdeacon of Maidstone, *Disestablishment and Disendowment by Instalment, and Piecemeal* (Rivingtons) deals especially with the question of burial fees and the agitation conducted by the Liberation Society. It has valuable notes.

Among recently published Sermons we would note an excellent one addressed to the Ely Theological College by the Bishop of Colchester (Rivingtons); one of singular earnestness, preached by the Bishop of Ely to the Ely Branch of the Church of England Working Men's Society, under the title of 'S. Paul as a Working Man' (Cambridge: Spalding); and a sermon entitled *Many Members and One Body* (Edinburgh: Grant), preached at Glasgow before the Representative Council of the Scotch Episcopal Church by the Bishop of Durham. It is difficult to find out for what persecuted people it is that Mr. Begbie pleads in a sermon called *Toleration* (Rivingtons), preached on 'Temperance Sunday,' which appears to have been Nov. 12th, last year. It is only the really temperate who seem now to need protection.

A *brochure* entitled *On the Revised Version of the New Testament*, by the Rev. Edward Marshall (Parker & Co.), takes a sensible view of the whole subject, and is fairer to the Greek Text of Westcott and Hort than the majority of recent criticisms.

Mr. Duke's most important and suggestive pamphlet, entitled *The Question of Incest relatively to Marriage with Sisters in Succession* (Rivingtons, 1883) has most deservedly gone into a second edition. We rejoice to say that the Marriage Law Defence Union, 20 Cockspur Street, continues its most useful work with energy and success. Its publications deserve a very wide circulation.

It argues well for the growth of theological and psychological study that such a solid work as Mr. Heard's *Tripartite Nature of Man* (Edinburgh: Clark) has reached another, and that a fifth, edition.

Prebendary Meyrick's reprint of Bishop Cosin's *Religion, Discipline, and Doctrine of the Church of England* (Rivingtons) has appeared in a second edition. This little treatise was written at the instance of Clarendon. It would be found useful in many places at home. The Anglo-Continental Society have translated it into almost all European tongues.

Dr. Baker has published, for the use of his upper forms in Merchant Taylors' School, a concise and scholarlike *Exposition of the XXXIX Articles* (Rivingtons). We recommend it for use in schools of a higher grade, as a supplement to Dr. Maclear's invaluable Handbooks.

THE

CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Nº XXXII. *JULY* 1883.

ART. I.—CHURCH ORGANIZATION IN THE ROYAL NAVY.

1. *Church Organization in the Royal Navy.* (Portsea, 1881.)
2. *Lay Work in the Royal Navy.* (Portsea, 1881.)
3. *Reports of the Committee of the Convocation of Canterbury on Spiritual Provision for English Seamen at Home and in Foreign Parts.* (1877–9.)
4. *Temperance Work in the Navy.* (London.)
5. *Church Congress Report,* 1876: Speech by the Rev. J. B. HARBORD, M.A., R.N. (now Chaplain of the Fleet).
6. *A Seaman's Life on Board a Man-of-War.* (Portsea, 1881.)

IT was, we believe, in 1864 that the phrase 'the Church in the Navy' first came into general use. An anonymous circular, printed on a single sheet of blue note-paper, headed *The Church in the Navy,* A.D. 1864, was in that year distributed throughout Her Majesty's Fleet. It dealt with the question of Church organization in the Royal Navy; and had been preceded, two years before, by a similar circular entitled *Religion in the Navy,* 1861. The change of title served to emphasize what was apt to be forgotten by Naval men, that the Church was not the creation of the Admiralty, and that its clergy had other 'Instructions' than those which emanated from Whitehall. The circular of 1864 formed the basis of a prolonged agitation, in which most of the magazines and newspapers connected with the Church and with the Navy took part, with the object of procuring for Naval chaplains liberty to do their duty, and for seamen and marines the full benefits of the services of their clergy. In summing up its suggestions, the later circular said—

'The end sought in these proposals is to place the clergyman face to face with his work, to bring the seaman and the chaplain together;

for whilst as to the number of the clergy, few people are so well cared for as in the Royal Navy, the proportion being about 100 chaplains to 70,000 seamen and marines, circumstances have combined in former days to cause clerical labours and their fruits to be very far below what might reasonably have been expected from these proportions.'

That there was some discrepancy between the proportion of chaplains serving on board ship and the influence they exerted, these circulars showed. For example, it was only in August 1861 that orders were issued—

'For public daily morning prayers, a custom which had then recently become general; for administering the Holy Communion when convenient, a practice still uncommon; and for the chaplain's daily attendance on the sick.'

That it was a day of small things appears from the circular of 1861, in which we read that—

'One or two ships have introduced the periodical administration of the Lord's Supper, a custom the revival of which the *New Admiralty Instructions* seem to contemplate. . . . It has been observed that the attendance is most numerous where the little week-evening gathering has paved the way for personal intercourse between priest and people, and led to mutual confidence and esteem.'

This matter seems to have advanced in 1864, as we read that—

'It is proposed that direction be given for the celebration of the Holy Communion in the ordinary place for holding Divine Service, the practice of administering it in the captain's cabin being found practically to exclude the ship's company. This suggestion having been adopted in a line-of-battle ship of the Channel squadron in 1861, at the celebration of the first Communion thirty of the crew attended; but in that ship a place was set apart in the evening hours where the men off duty met and prepared for this Service. In another line-of-battle ship in the same squadron, at the same time, the celebration took place in the captain's cabin, and there were no preparatory classes; only two men attended. Yet both the chaplain and captain of this latter ship were very solicitous of their spiritual charge.'

In many details the services of the chaplains were crippled, and their presence on board ship rendered of comparatively little use. The distribution also of the Naval clergy presented curious anomalies. With rare exceptions the labours of each chaplain were confined to his own individual ship and, without a boat at his disposal, he was unable to comfor the sick and dying, or to officiate to the hale in the small vessels anchored near. Even at Portsmouth and Devonpo where from eight to twelve Naval chaplains are often prese

together, no provision is made for the pastoral visitation of the numerous other ships in those harbours. Accordingly, the circular of 1864 suggests—

'That the chaplains of the Steam Reserve should personally visit their outlying ships, in which about 1,500 men at each port are scattered in small numbers, receiving no religious advantages save the attendance, perhaps once a month, at the Sunday-morning service in the central ship. Also, that the numerous tenders and small ships in commission at these home ports would give full employment to an additional clergyman, who might be attached to the Naval hospitals, and placed under the guidance of the chaplains of those establishments, a boat being placed at his disposal. The importance of this subject may be estimated when it is considered that there are generally from 150 to 200 vessels in commission (the Royal yachts amongst the number), whose crews, varying from 35 to 200 men each, are too small to entitle them to carry a chaplain.' 'There are,' says the circular of 1861, 'about 140 ships of war, besides 50 gunboats, manned by upwards of 17,000 men, which have not the advantage of a chaplain's influence.'

Neither in the circulars, nor in the public discussions to which they gave rise, was any prominence given to the personal requirements of the chaplains. Entirely unselfish, the appeals of the Naval chaplains dealt with their desire for freedom to do their work, and to accord to the crews such benefits as their appointment to the Navy presupposed their ability to confer. There was but one apparent, but only apparent, exception to this silence as to personal advantages. The circular of 1864 says, 'The first and foremost requirement is a suitable place of retirement for the chaplain, where he may study and write, and be "in secret," and attend more earnestly to his private religious duties. His dark, ill-ventilated, noisy, sleeping cabin cannot, by any distortion of language, be called a "study."' We have known chaplains rise at midnight that they might obtain in the silent hours of the night that quietude for study that is denied them by day. Their sleeping bunks are commonly situated in the ward-room, where every idle and thoughtless word uttered by some fifteen to twenty young officers, as well as by a bevy of men-servants, is distinctly audible. This is felt by many clergymen to be the greatest trial they have to endure on board ship, and its amelioration would greatly help them to maintain a higher spiritual and intellectual standard.

Isolated from each other, and from their brethren on shore, without any personal knowledge of one another, any official bond of union, or any spiritual superior, each chaplain stands alone in his own ship, and to speak of Church organiza-

tion in the Navy is to dwell on hopes of the future rather than of that which has actual existence. As Lord Clarence Paget, then Secretary of the Admiralty, told the House of Commons in 1864, 'It was thought that Naval chaplains should be under no other authority than the captains of their respective ships'—that is, with no bond of united action, no superior adviser, no central overseer. Yet the evidence of several distinguished officers before the Committee on Naval Promotion and Retirement in the previous year was in favour of reviving the Order in Council of 1812, and reappointing to the office of Chaplain-General of the Navy. The wishes of the chaplains are divided on this question, but beyond them are the general spiritual interests of the fleet, three-fourths of the ships of which, including coastguard cruisers and watch-vessels, do not carry chaplains. These interests embrace many matters in which the laity are much concerned, and which it is nobody's business to oversee. True, since 1829 the Chaplain of Greenwich Hospital has been called the Head of the Chaplains, but he has no official relations with them; he is also now entitled Chaplain of the Fleet, but, save through the pages of the *Navy List*, not an officer or man in the fleet is even aware of the name of the able and excellent holder of this high-sounding office. They neither see him nor hear of or from him. He is understood to be consulted by the Admiralty in the original selection of clergymen to act as chaplains; and if his advice is sought in other matters, he is expected to give it; whilst their lordships also pass on to him the quarterly returns received through the admirals and captains from the chaplains of ships. The appointments and other matters concerning chaplains are managed by the Naval captain, who, for the time being, acts as private secretary to the First Lord of the Admiralty. The quasi-episcopal office is thus exercised in the name of the First Lord of the Admiralty and by his lay secretary.

So far as the fleet is aware, the real head of religious matters in the Royal Navy is to be found at the Gospel Hall, Devonport, in the person of an excellent Christian lady, whose name, teaching, and deeds are known to every officer and man on board Her Majesty's ships. It is to that good lady, and not to the so-called Chaplain of the Fleet, that the crews ordered on foreign service or on hazardous expeditions look for the personal visit, the cheering parting words, and the subsequent printed pastorals. We concur with the Naval Church Society's prize essay on *Lay Work in the Royal Navy*, that 'this helplessness for active good must have been most

galling to the pious, judicious, and capable clergymen who have successively occupied the chaplaincy of Greenwich Hospital.' The anonymous circular of 1864 well says, 'The fact of 152 clergymen existing in a body without ecclesiastical control is an anomaly in the Church, which provides more carefully for the Dyaks, the Red Indians, and the Africans.' But this is not merely a clerical matter. There are active religious movements permeating the fleet. The officers and men, left practically without personal religious guidance, have to seek direction where they can. Hence, though 74 per cent. of the crews are Churchmen, many of the religious activities have no Church character. We know something of the dissidence of dissent even on shore where it has ministers and creeds to keep it within some bounds. But on board the Queen's ships there is nothing to restrain those who forsake the old paths. Each seaman who throws over the Church's rule becomes a law unto himself, invents his own religion, and adopts that which is right in his own eyes. Hence the most lamentable results to the private character and to the public conduct. Naval discipline is endangered; leave-breaking and its accompanying vices become common; disease, the fruit of vice, is engendered; and all the time the ship may be carrying a zealous chaplain who, under the present system, is comparatively useless. Naval officers greatly blame the chaplains for not exerting a greater personal influence on board, for not being more frequently the friends and advisers of individual men, and for not being generally looked up to by the more devout men as their counsellors and guides. But there is still great truth in what Mr. Charles Hanbury Tracy told the House of Commons in 1865, 'That the great majority of the chaplains did their duty as far as they could, but they were unable to do all the good which might result from their efforts under a better system. . . . The system was unjust to the chaplains, unjust to the Navy, and unjust to the country at large.'

It is not always possible to measure spiritual influences, or to estimate religious forces. But Naval officers ask how it is that, all the chaplains being Church of England clergymen, and 74 per cent. of the crews being also baptized in the Church, the temperance work in the Navy is done almost wholly in connection with Nonconformist agencies. Total abstinence is the rule amongst the temperance men afloat, and modesty is not a characteristic of teetotallers. Intolerance is not unknown amongst their ranks. Where one man in six is a total abstainer, and about one in sixty is a

temperance worker in one way or another, it is worthy of consideration that a very small part of this extensive movement is in connection with the Church of England Temperance Society. There is a great danger of temperance being made a new religion. The self-conceit too often thus generated is naturally arrayed against those Naval chaplains who hold aloof. Many earnest officers and men are obliged to identify themselves with dissenting temperance agencies, because there is no combined action of the Naval clergy to furnish the necessary organization on a Church basis. This is only a sample of several good movements of which the Naval chaplains, if combined, might be the leaders; but from which, save one here and there acting as an isolated individual and for his own ship only, they are quite shut out. The loss is not only to the temperance cause, but to Church work; for many of the more earnest and devout seamen are total abstainers, and when they find that the chaplain is not one, and is not willing to be their leader, they seek guidance in religion, as in temperance, elsewhere. Though this is an obvious instance of the loss sustained by the Naval Church from the absence of combination on the part of the chaplains, it is by no means the only one.

It is very painful to find officers and men meeting together on shore for Bible reading, united prayer, or other spiritual or recreating purposes, and not even expecting a chaplain to be present, or remarking on his absence. We thus find certain ladies at some ports conducting services of various kinds for seamen, and being looked up to as the natural leaders of men-of-war's men and marines in their religious and domestic troubles. It is well known what great difficulties non-resident seamen in uniform, in strange ports, have to procure admission to the parish churches. As a consequence, although men-of-war's men attend public prayers daily on board ship, few of them are found attending seaport churches. As two-thirds of the crews at the home ports are landed from Saturday till Monday every week, this is an important question. An individual chaplain may not feel himself in a position to remonstrate with the parochial clergy and their churchwardens. With eight to twelve chaplains in the port, much might, however, be done were they able to act in union, to watch over the general interests of seamen and of their families, and to supply what is lacking.

It was hoped, when the Naval Church Society was formed in 1872, that it would tend to draw chaplains from their isolation and supply a cohesive principle, which would unite

them for the common interests of the whole fleet outside of the duties of their separate ships. But, so far, this cohesion seems to be as lacking now as before. A naval officer visiting Portsmouth two summers ago relates that, being greatly struck with a very fervent and eloquent sermon preached in the Dockyard Chapel, he asked the chaplain of a ship who had been present who the preacher was. He did not know. Further inquiry elicited that the preacher was one of his brother chaplains, twelve of whom were then present at Portsmouth. It thus appeared that these chaplains were unknown to one another even by sight. If every ship had a chaplain, and all the interests of seamen and their families were bound up in their vessels, this absence of combined purpose might be excusable. But there were at least forty or fifty Admiralty ships carrying men, besides many merchant vessels and a large maritime population in that harbour, never visited by a clergyman. And, nowadays, seamen have wives and families, with the domestic cares and responsibilities, joys and sorrows, which that relation involves, and in which Naval chaplains could exercise an influence as well as those outside agencies to which we have referred.

No good purpose can be served by shutting our ears to what officers and men generally remark upon. No one accuses the Naval clergy of any remissness as to their regulation duties in their respective ships, nor of any personal misconduct unworthy of their sacred office. But trammelled as they are by mere officialism, cabined, cribbed, confined, in their particular vessels, they are too apt, by lack of contact with their brethren, if not to lose spirituality, at least to lose spiritual force; and they may thus be led to look at their duties too exclusively through the medium of the *Admiralty Instructions.* Everybody knows how exceedingly reverential seamen are: but is it not odd that they never kneel in public worship, and that no chaplain expects them to do so? No men are more fond of song: yet choral services are almost unknown. Obedience and love of order is part of the Naval profession: yet it is taken as a matter of course that devout seamen should not obey the injunction given by the Master the same night that He was betrayed, 'Do this in remembrance of Me.'

Many of the Naval clergy feel, no doubt, that they could effect much more for the good of seamen if they were not so persistently thwarted by old-fashioned platitudes and obsolete conservatism. But they are by no means agreed as to a remedy. Many of the seniors are content with things as they

are; but amongst the juniors a desire for more liberty is generally felt.

'We all feel, sadly feel,' wrote an Oxonian, 'our isolation. We are mere units, struggling amidst a sea of iniquity; we sadly feel the want of sympathy, we long for one to whom we may apply with confidence for advice or help amidst the difficulties that beset us —one of superior talent and learning, who could counsel us wisely, and if necessary speak for us bravely—such a man as Bishop Ken was when he served afloat as chaplain of the fleet. How can we be thoroughly alive while we have no head?'

The Convocation of Canterbury in their third Report on Spiritual Provision for English Seamen, announce the result of a circular sent to every chaplain of the Royal Navy, asking whether he is in favour of the appointment of a chaplain-general in Episcopal orders or not. 'A considerable majority of the chaplains of the Royal Navy are in favour of the above-named appointment.'

If the ten years' existence of the Naval Church Society has not done much to unite the Naval chaplains as an organized body for common objects, it has at least produced an interesting volume on *Church Organization in the Royal Navy*, which is worthy of special attention. The volume consists of seventeen essays and papers by as many writers, and is, perhaps, somewhat confusing in the number and variety of its suggestions. Most of these were written in competition for a prize on the subject of the promotion of religion on board men-of-war. The prize was awarded to an essay on *Lay Work in the Royal Navy*, which deals with Church organization, especially as it affects that great majority of the Queen's ships which are seldom or never visited by a clergyman. It must not be supposed that, because about three-fourths of the vessels under the Admiralty do not carry chaplains, religious worship is neglected on board. On the contrary, not only do the officers conduct Divine Service on Sundays, and short public prayers on week-day mornings, but in many of these smaller vessels Bible classes, prayer meetings, temperance organizations, adult schools, &c., are in full operation under the volunteer management of officers or petty officers. The prize essay on *Lay Work in the Royal Navy* developes a scheme for bringing all these volunteer workers under the training and guidance of the chaplains. At present these self-constituted teachers have no instruction, training, or guidance. Many of them have never spoken to a Naval chaplain on religious matters in their lives, perhaps never had the opportunity of receiving the Holy Communion

on board ship, and are indebted for their knowledge of Divine things to brother seamen or to chance books. Meanwhile there are about forty-three seagoing ships carrying chaplains, and about forty-six other chaplains holding stationary appointments at various ports, twenty-four of which are afloat. The prize essay would delegate the instruction and training of the volunteer lay teachers to the forty-six stationary chaplains, and their oversight and guidance to those in seagoing ships, or principally to the chaplains of the flagships of the commanders-in-chief or commodores commanding the eleven naval stations into which the waters of the world are divided. It is desired that the whole of the religious arrangements on each naval station should be in charge of the chaplain of the flagship, who should be selected, not for his seniority, but for his tact, judgment, and mission spirit. It is customary for certain officers of the commander-in-chief's ship to take precedence of others of the same rank in the other, or (as they are called) 'private,' ships; so that the precedence suggested for the flag-chaplain over his brethren on the same station would not be unusual from a Naval point of view, any more than from that of the Church. It is not, however, proposed that, except perhaps as inspector of schools, the flag-chaplain should interfere in ships carrying chaplains, but be like a rural dean on shore. Nevertheless, he should have powers to regulate their labours as to work outside of their several ships, so as to secure that the vessels which do not carry chaplains should be pastorally visited, and that seamen when on shore should be provided for. It is hoped that in this way cohesion might be applied to the chaplains serving under the same admiral, and that a variety of religious interests affecting seamen when in port, where moral dangers most abound, might receive some attention. *Lay Work in the Royal Navy* regards the proposed functions of the flag-chaplains as fundamental. Without the creation of such an office the author has no hope of making the chaplains of the forty-three seagoing ships at all adequately useful to the 190 vessels, including some fifty coastguard cruisers, &c., which are now rarely visited by the Naval clergy. He regards the revival of this ancient office as essential to any real advance. The old custom was for the commanders-in-chief, who felt anxious about discipline, morality, and religious life in their squadrons, to select clergymen of piety, authority, and learning as their 'chaplains of the fleet,' 'for the better government of the clergy who were chaplains in the fleet,' to quote Admiral Lord Dartmouth's words when inviting Dr.

Peachell, Master of Magdalen College, Cambridge, to occupy that office in his command in 1688. These superior clergymen continued with the admirals as personal advisers in religious matters whilst their flags were flying, and were frequently rewarded on their return to England by gifts of suitable preferment. It was under such a system that men of ability, piety, and zeal, like the great Bishop Ken, did honour to this office in the fleet which went to Tangier in 1683. A flag-chaplain attached, as of old, to each commander-in-chief, and having oversight of all religious matters affecting seamen on the whole Naval station, whether afloat or on shore, would be a great support and help to his brethren in the same fleet. Without exercising any positive authority, but acting simply as a *primus inter pares*, he would by his friendly relations to the commander-in-chief on the one hand, and on the other by his experience, persuasion, and tact, instructing the younger chaplains in their difficult duties, smooth their way for increased usefulness and beneficial influence; whilst the crews of the more numerous vessels without chaplains would find in him a friend, and the common religious interests of the whole station now uncared for would have adequate supervision and thought.

Great credit is due to the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury for its four Reports on Spiritual Provision for Seamen in English and Foreign Ports. Opinions may differ as to its recommendations, but it is noteworthy that the 'Missions to Seamen' Society, with forty-eight years' experience of Church work on the waters, has already adopted several of the suggestions of Convocation, and has proclaimed its desire to carry out several of the others so soon as funds admit. The amended version of the first Report, which had been somewhat hastily issued in its unrevised form, is not so generally known in the Royal Navy, to which it specially refers, as it deserves. The second Report, which is on *Church Work amongst Seamen in Sixty-four Home Ports*, is a very exhaustive and able investigation of that part of the subject. Whilst the third Report, which is on *British Seamen abroad*, lays down some excellent principles deserving of more general application. The fourth Report is a book of short prayers for week-day use on board ship, which has been published for sale by the S. P. C. K.

Amongst other recommendations is the creation of itinerant chaplaincies at the principal Naval ports for the pastoral visitation of the numerous crews who are without chaplains. Convocation says there is nothing new in this recommenda-

tion, as 'The Missions to Seamen' has for twenty-six years employed chaplains to officiate from ship to ship, day by day, in several seaports and roadsteads. The harbour chaplains, as Convocation calls them, would not relieve the officers of their present religious duties. They would board the ships which have no chaplains during the dinner hour, and in the evenings. The harbour chaplain would not be attached (except nominally for pay) to any one ship; but would reside on shore, and receive a boat allowance to make him quite free in the choice of hours for ship visitation. He should be a young clergyman, specially selected with a view to these mission duties, and should be subordinated to a senior chaplain, whether of the flagship or of the dockyard. A private society, like 'The Missions to Seamen,' readily finds twenty-three suitable clergymen capable of thus itinerating, day by day, from ship to ship, not only in harbours, but also in open roadsteads, and is only stayed by lack of funds from employing other available candidates. Surely if there was any Church organization at all in the Royal Navy, the Admiralty would find even less difficulty in procuring young clergymen with special aptitude for dealing with men willing to undertake these nautical mission functions. The present waste of clerical force, and the needs of these small craft are so obvious, that it is only the system, or rather the absence of system, which prevents such an essential want being quickly supplied. 'Who is to see that this free lance does his duty?' was the pathetic question of a former First Naval Lord, when the idea was proposed to him. The admiral's chaplain or the dockyard chaplain should be responsible to the commander-in-chief for the harbour chaplain's daily work, is the reply made by *Lay Work in the Royal Navy.*

It is not, let it be understood, additional Naval chaplains that are asked for; but such a re-distribution of the existing number that their services shall cover the whole fleet, not, as at present, only about one-fourth of the vessels under the Admiralty. The Church organization which, without additional expense, would effect this extension of labours is worth consideration. There is one chaplain to every 700 men—quite enough, in all reason. But they are so distributed as not to reach three-fourths of the vessels. Substituting itinerating harbour chaplaincies for certain ship chaplaincies would, when the ships are in certain ports, remove this anomaly. The plan sketched in *Lay Work in the Royal Navy* for the instruction and guidance of lay helpers would extend the influence of the clergy over the smaller vessels when at sea. Convocation

mentions approvingly what 'The Missions to Seamen' chaplains are able to effect by voluntary deputies in the merchant service. That society has some 350 officers and 130 seamen enrolled as helpers or associates for the promotion of godly living on board merchant ships. Its chaplains keep up communication with their helpers in all parts of the world, supplying them with books, &c., and they thus extend their own influence and teaching to every ocean. That which, in the absence of organization, the Admiralty find impossible, a private society, without a Naval Discipline Act to fall back upon, has been doing for twenty-six years, not only on board merchant vessels, but also on board ships of war.

There is no doubt that there has been great moral, intellectual, and physical improvement in the Royal Navy of late years; but the chaplain's department has not quite kept pace with it. The system formerly in vogue of withholding payment of wages dominated the moral and disciplinary spheres. Frequent and therefore smaller payments are now made on a system which allows the authorities not only to permit but to encourage moral and religious agencies. A new generation of officers is growing up by whom the former moral *régime* is regarded as a professional disgrace. But in a highly conservative service the officers are naturally sensitive as to their own authority. Captains have always regarded moral influence as a power to be exercised mainly, if not solely, by themselves. A chaplain who would really be the friend of each man on board may or may not be, in their eyes, an agreeable adjunct. Would the moral influence of an active chaplain detract from that wielded by the captain? There are indiscreet and injudicious clergymen: suppose the active chaplain who ingratiated himself with the officers and crew proved to be such an one? Is it worth the risk? 'Do you think, sir, that the taxpayers of England send you out here to be a missionary to seamen? No, sir; you are sent here to fulfil such duties as I direct you to do under the *Admiralty Instructions*,' was uttered by one of the most gentlemanly of admirals to one of the best of Naval chaplains, not many years since.

The nature of our subject has compelled attention to the shortcomings rather than to the virtues of the Naval system. It is only fair that the other side should be briefly referred to. An ably written pamphlet on *A Seaman's Life on board a Man-of-War* enumerates in detail the great attention bestowed by the Naval authorities on the education, religious instruction, training, and recreation of men-of-war's men. The

writer shows the more favourable side of the shield. He speaks of the Navy as it is; but, in an opening paragraph, he slightly raises the curtain to reveal a little of the horrible moral degradation which the Naval authorities and pay system favoured fifty years ago. Officers not fifty years old have been much shocked at the publication of that paragraph. Yet it hardly touches the fringe of the nauseous deeds then fostered, and is not out of place as showing from what degrading depths the Navy has risen to its present lofty moral, intellectual, and physical height. In emerging from such moral debasement, it is not to be wondered that some indefensible customs have been continued, and that some absurd ideas as to what is 'impossible' as to devotion on board ships of war have been retained. The men have changed, the moral atmosphere has changed; and it is essential that, the conditions being changed, the methods of supplying religious instruction should change also. If the more thoughtful and more devout officers and men are not to slip away from the Church altogether, and to be handed over to the uncertain vagaries of 'non-sectarian' agencies, there must be much more extensive spiritual provision. The prejudices of Naval officers have been overborne in many things during the last quarter of a century; and their remaining prejudices must not be suffered to stand between the chaplains supplied at the expense of the country and the souls to which they ought to minister. If the few ships bearing chaplains are not in a much higher moral and religious condition than the many without chaplains, why subject the country to the expense of providing clergymen? But if the few favoured crews derive special spiritual privileges from the presence of chaplains, why not seek to extend these to the more numerous vessels now shut out from these religious advantages? Nobody wishes to displace the Admiralty authority, nor that of the several commanders-in-chief, in the due government of the Naval chaplains. All that is asked is that subordinated to the Naval authorities, and therefore directly responsible thereto, the duties of the Naval clergy shall be so organized as to reach most effectively the persons to whom the country erroneously supposes they fully minister. This is all that is meant by the Naval officers and Naval chaplains who have, for so many years, pleaded for Church organization in the Royal Navy.

ART. II.—THE LEGAL AND HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE STUDY OF THE CANON LAW.

Corpus Juris Canonici, post Æmilii Lud. Richteri curas, edidit ÆMILIUS FRIEDBERG. (Lips., 1879.)

THE appearance of the most perfect text of the *Corpus Juris Canonici* which has ever been produced in Europe, the life-long labour of two of its greatest canonists, cannot but reawaken the interest of the learned world to a branch of study which has, since the days of the Reformation, fallen (at least in England) into an almost entire abeyance. Much may be said in explanation of this absolute neglect of what was once the text-book alike of lawyers and divines, the study which gave them the twofold title 'Juris utriusque Doctor,' the highest legal degree in earlier days, though now superseded by the LL.D. which traces a faint shadow of the older learning, or the D.C.L. which fairly surrenders the Canonical degree and relegates the study of the Canon Law to legal antiquaries or controversial divines. Few Englishmen of our time could aspire to the older degree, and among these the late Sir George Bowyer would have ranked as *facile princeps.*

We have observed that much may be said in explanation of this utter disregard of a branch of learning whose reign in the schools of Europe had for centuries been as absolute as it was universal; but much probably may be urged in its extenuation. Long before the copy of the Canon and Pontifical Law was burned by Luther at Wittemberg, in spite of the earnest protests of its two professors, Henning von Göden and Hieronymus Schurff, who, like the good counsellors of the Jewish king, 'made intercession' with the too zealous Reformer 'that he would not burn the roll,' the Canon Law proper had so given way before the Decretals which supplemented it, that the title of 'Doctor in Decretals' superseded the earlier one, and the study of the great digest of Gratian had fallen into almost absolute desuetude. The discovery of the successive forgeries on which this attempt of Gratian to reconcile the conflicting laws of the Church was founded produced so great a reaction in the mind of the learned world against its claims, that the members of the Reformed Churches, forgetful of its historic value, of its controversial importance, and of the precious fragments of an earlier legislation which

are embedded in its pages, poured contempt upon the whole system; while the members of the Roman Communion, who had antiquated and even abrogated the greater part of its teaching during the fifteenth century, at the Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle, and whose latest teaching rested exclusively on the voice of the present Church as against even the more recent past, began to regard it rather as an antiquarian repertory than as a living code. When its origin and authority were first impugned, the Jesuit Turrianus rushed forward in its defence; but he soon found himself alone in the unequal warfare, the present Church finding in these ancient records too many proofs of the conflict of the older law with their own theory and practice to induce them to go forth under so impetuous a leader. They silently deserted the ancient fortress and almost joined their adversaries in razing the very foundations of it. Nay, they even discovered that important parts of the *Decretum* of Gratian were absolutely opposed to the modern doctrines of Rome, especially the divisions *De Pœnitentia* and *De Consecratione*, of the former of which Antonius Augustinus, Archbishop of Tarragona († 1586), affirms, 'Tota hæc distinctio plus nocet nobis quam prodest.'[1] Such were the principal causes of the universal neglect of this once supremely honoured branch of study, and in them we may find the grounds of its extenuation.

Yet perhaps the principal cause of this neglect in our own more enlightened age, in which the revived studies of history and archæology have rescued so much that must else have perished and become lost to the learned world, is the fact that the value of the Codex both for historical and legal reference has suffered as much from the depravation of the text as from the discovery of the illegitimacy of the sources from which it is derived. Not a sentence or a word could be accepted as genuine and authentic in the numerous editions which appeared during the fifteenth and the early part of the sixteenth centuries. No effort had been put forth to investigate the sources of this vast and heterogeneous body of laws. No attempt had been made to distinguish the actual text of Gratian's elaborate compilation from the glosses which had crept into it, nor to separate Gratian's own comments from the canons, or extracts from the Fathers, upon which they were based. The glosses which gradually intruded themselves into the *Decretum*, and were the conclusions which the early lecturers on Gratian had derived from the text, some of them dating even from his own age (1127–51), were naturally

[1] *De Emend. Gratiani*, l. i. dial. 18, p. 288.

devoid of legal authority, and could only be regarded as the commentaries of our own lawyers would be on the statute law. These, which are termed the *paleæ*, 'the lighter grain,'[1] and often perhaps the mere chaff, of the legal harvest, had become so mixed up with the full ears of corn that until the present edition of Dr. Friedberg the student of the Canon Law was ever in danger of mistaking the *paleæ* for the actual text of Gratian. Manuscripts had been rarely or never consulted and compared. The *paleæ*, extremely few in the earlier MSS., and sometimes even left in the margin, were not sufficiently separated from the text, and everywhere the greatest confusion prevailed. What Gratian had termed a 'Concordance of Discordant Canons'[2] (and this is the true title of his work) presented itself as a conflict of laws which all the skill of the greatest jurists would have failed to terminate. To rescue from utter ruin and to restore to life a code which had become from all these causes little more than a dead letter, a commission of cardinals and canonists was appointed by Pope Pius IV. to revise the text of Gratian from its first sources. Their labours, carried on through the two succeeding pontificates, were not concluded until 1582, in which year Gregory XIII. gave to their work an authoritative publication. This recension, valuable as it is, and forming, as it does, the basis of every subsequent one, has in it nevertheless several serious defects which until the present edition of Dr. Friedberg were not in any degree removed. Dr. Justus Henning Böhmer, the greatest canonist ever produced by any of the Churches of the Reformation, availed himself of the labours of the Roman revisionists in re-editing the Codex, and his edition was regarded during the last century as a work till then unequalled in its accuracy and of paramount authority among the many editions which the revival of the study (especially in Germany) had witnessed. But he followed the text of the Roman edition, which had restored the text of Gratian *according to the original authorities he had cited* rather than *according to the earliest and most authentic MSS. of Gratian himself*, and hence the conclusions of Gratian as well as the *paleæ* which supplemented them fell into unnatural conflict with the text itself. The new wine was

[1] Various explanations have been given of this term, but the simplest, which is here adopted, is evidently the best. In the Middle Ages such words as *paleæ* and *zizania* were often used to designate a lighter kind of literature, and the former would be very suitable for glosses such as these.

[2] See the Preface of the Roman Commission for the 'Emendation of Gratian.'

put into old bottles and the new cloth into the old garment. The genuine commentary on a corrupted text could alone present the work in that historic form in which it was first cast, and in which it had first reigned supreme. But as the Pope and his commission had in view not the restoration of a historic monument, but the production of an authoritative body of laws and its adaptation to the altered state of society, every canon of the councils and quotation from the Fathers was amended according to its original form. But this was, in effect, the construction of a new text; and as in law every word has its value, it presented to a certain extent the appearance of a new code. The next editor with whose name this edition is associated, the profoundly learned Dr. Æmilius Richter, so closely followed Böhmer in his adoption of the text of the Roman revisers that there seemed (as Dr. Friedberg observes) hardly an adequate reason for the production of his edition on the mere ground of the *text* of Gratian. In regard to the indication of the sources of the code and in the more judicious separation of the actual words of the compiler from those of his commentators, he nevertheless effected a vast improvement on the edition of Böhmer, till then of paramount authority. Mgr. Nardi, in his *Elementi di Diritto Ecclesiastico* (part i. p. 112), terms the edition of Dr. Richter 'recentissima e pregievolissima edizione.' It is difficult to conceive a word of higher commendation, and yet had he seen the present second edition of Richter, as perfected by Friedberg, he would perhaps have transferred to that the superlative he had so justly assigned to the former one. For the latter editor, following the lines laid down by his predecessor, has not only restored the superstructure, but repaired the foundation, by a careful collation of many of the most important MSS. both of Gratian and of the Decretals and Extravagants, and, instead of producing the text which Gratian *ought* to have used, exhibits that which he actually did use. He has thus restored to us this great code exactly as it presented itself to the mediæval lawyers and divines, and given it that true historic form which, now that its legal authority has departed, is the only one which can interest or enlighten our age. Those only who have compared the present edition with the preceding ones can form the slightest idea of the gigantic labours of the men who have planned and completed a work like this. Dr. Friedberg observes justly that the collation of all the MSS. of Gratian which are scattered through the libraries of Europe would be a task so arduous that it must exceed the powers of any one man and need the united

labours 'of a body of men to effect' (Prol. p. xciv.); and we might well add that the same might be said of his own edition, were it not that he has proved the possibility of a single mind producing a work in some sense greater than that which he has here indicated. He may well, then, invite us to 'remember, in passing judgment upon his work, the amount of labour and care which must be borne by one whose object is to restore the genuine form of so weighty a body of law as this even with the least degree of probability.'

But the invitation which is thus given us to a study hitherto so neglected, and the opportunity of referring to a perfect text of the Canon Law, as well as to an accurate indication of its sources, leads us naturally to inquire into the history and varied fortunes of a code which has had so great an influence, however indirectly, in the formation of the general system of law under which we live, and which often appears in a more direct form in the ecclesiastical controversies which have been so frequent in recent years. The Western Church, unlike the Eastern, which had codified the ante-Nicene canons and obtained their ratification in the Council of Nice,

> 'knew no canons before that Council, but depended on the authority of the Scriptures, of custom, and of unwritten law. After the Nicene Council it only received the canons therein drawn up, until the time of Innocent I., whose pontificate began in the opening of the fifth century.'[1]

At this period it began to imitate the Eastern method and to reduce the laws of the Church to the form of a regular code. This led to the incorporation of the Canons of Ancyra, Neocæsaræa, Gangre, and Laodicea with those of Nice, these having been included under the general title of *Nicene*, as representing the principal and most important of the laws of the Church Universal. The seven canons of the Council of Constantinople were added by Stephen, Bishop of Ephesus, while those of Ephesus and Chalcedon were incorporated with the code at a later period. This codification of the Western body of laws has been popularly attributed to Dionysius Exiguus (A.D. 525), though it appears, from the collection of canons which Pope Zosimus (A.D. 414) endeavoured to obtrude upon the Synod of Carthage in defence of the appellate jurisdiction of Rome, that a code numbering eighty canons, and including the disputed appellate law of the Council of Sardica, already existed in the West, a fact which has been justly held

[1] Gerh. von Mastricht, *Hist. Juris Eccl. et Pontif.*, Halæ, 1719, pp. 31–33.

to account for the controversy on the extent of the Nicene canons, for which the same number was asserted. Be this as it may, we must admit that the development of this primitive code was due to Dionysius, whose knowledge of Greek enabled him to translate the codex of the Eastern Church in a larger form, including in it not only the canons of the African and Western Churches, but also such 'decretals' of the Popes as could then be found. It was thus that the synodical laws of the Church became first confounded with the decrees of the Roman bishops, and a composite system introduced into the code, which in the course of its history made it such a body of conflicting laws as to render the reconciliation of its decrees a difficult task even in that early day. The work of Dionysius was almost immediately received and adopted at Rome, though most of the separate Churches of the West retained their own codes until long after, those of Gaul, Spain, and Africa having an older and a later version of the 'Universal Code,' while Britain, under the influence of the synod of Archbishop Theodore, adopted a code which, from Bede's description, had rather the form of the Eastern than the Roman collection. In the meantime the so-called Canons of the Apostles had crept surreptitiously into the Eastern code, and became through the authority of the second Constantinopolitan Council ('In Trullo') and the sixth Novella of Justinian an integral part of it. The Latin Church, however (according to the judgment of S. Isidore of Seville), did not recognize their authenticity, and placed them among the apocryphal canons; nor was their authority admitted until the time of Pope Leo IV., in the middle of the ninth century. The work of Dionysius produced many imitators, whose collections, failing in accuracy and arrangement, produced but a transient influence on the fortunes of the Canon Law. In the ninth century, however, that most impudent and most successful of impostors, Isidore Mercator (or more properly *Peccator*, a designation of humility frequent in ecclesiastics of that age, and too literally applicable in his own case), forged a series of decretal epistles of the earlier Popes, which at once overshadowed and blighted the ancient code of the Church, and constituted the fruitful materials for a system of law which at length excluded from the tribunals of Europe even the grand work of Justinian and the entire civil law of the Empire. The authentic decretals of the Popes, which began with those of Siricius (A.D. 385), had already found a place in the Dionysian collection. It was doubtless this fusion of canon and pontifical law which tempted the author of the Isidorian forgery

to palm on the Church the earlier series in which he endeavours to imitate the style and language of Scripture. The audacity of this work of fiction was only equalled by the extraordinary credulity which accepted it as authentic. Bearing in its front the great name of Isidore, which had made Seville illustrious, and representing an ecclesiastical state which, though somewhat advanced for the period of its production, yet not unfairly represented its leading features, the Isidorian collection was accepted almost immediately in France and Spain, though (contrary to the theory of those who give it a Roman origin) it was not received in Rome till many years later. Its immediate object (as is now universally admitted) was to break down the power of the metropolitans, who had hitherto exercised an almost feudal authority over the episcopate. But in doing this every intermediate power was destroyed, the ancient law of appeal abrogated, and the entire episcopate reduced to a dead level, over which the overwhelming supremacy of the Papacy rose, clothed in all those Divine attributes which culminated in the Hildebrandine development. Thus it had the twofold effect of giving greater apparent freedom to the bishops and of conferring upon the Papacy an authority absolutely independent of that patriarchal rank to which the ancient councils had restricted it. It was a bold attempt to shift the appellate jurisdiction from the nearer to the more distant tribunal; and as it fell in with the spirit of the age its success was equal to its boldness. A late writer even ventures to assert that its reception was less due to the object it had in view than to the fact that it was the perfect representation of the state of the Church at the time,[1] a theory adapted to the practice as it then existed. But the earlier lines of this remarkable forgery, notwithstanding its amazing barbarisms and anachronisms, indicate a study of the Apostolic epistles and the recovery in a certain degree of the ideal of the primitive Church, so obscured in a still later age. While there is much that exhibits the progress of the Church of Rome towards its absorption into the Court of Rome, there is much also that preserved during a darkening age the principles of liberty which were vindicated during the great synodical period (1410–1440). Hence arises the historical importance of this apocryphal contribution to the 'body of the Canon Law,' and its value as preserving even faintly the traditions of a better age. It cannot but be seen that the restoration of the true text of a forgery so unspeakably important

[1] Nardi, *Elementi di Diritto Eccl.* tom. i. p. 74.

in its results is at least as useful a work as the emendation of the text of some authentic work which has had no such world-wide influence. Hence the recension of Dr. Friedberg has a value to the lawyer and the historian far beyond that which at first sight it appears to possess. But the forged decretals form but a single element in the *Corpus Juris Canonici* itself. All that Dionysius had already collected in the way of canons and Papal decrees, with the numerous accessions his work received till the days of Leo IV. (A.D. 850), all that Burchard of Worms, Anselm of Lucca, Ivo of Chartres, Cardinal Deusdedit, and others had added or digested, in order to complete the code of the Western Church and to reduce it to a practical form, is recast and reproduced with vast additions in the *Decretum* (or rather *Decreta*) of Gratian, whose work, written between 1127 and 1151, is properly termed the *Concordance of Discordant Canons.* This, in its threefold division, forms the basis and chief portion of the 'Body of the Canon Law.' Upon this, as on a very compact though tesselated foundation, in which truth and error, genuine extracts and palpable forgeries, are strangely welded together, the great superstructure of Roman pontifical law has been raised. The compiler, a monk and native of Chiusi, in Tuscany, seems to have had as his object the reduction of the vast and scattered materials of the Canon Law into a form resembling that which the Civil Law had received in the Codex of Justinian. And so carefully did he proceed on the lines of this grand precedent that it was easy for his work to supersede the Imperial code in the day when the power of the Emperors was as entirely superseded by that of the Popes. The conflict between the two codes was carried on as late as the days of S. Bernard, who complains to Eugenius III. that the 'laws of Justinian are more asserted in the courts than the laws of Christ.' It was to this same Pope that Gratian offered his work, though it does not seem to have actually received the Papal sanction. But its introduction into the schools and universities of Europe gave it a much greater than a mere pontifical authority, and the very degree of Bachelor (according to a learned canonist[1]) was first conferred upon the students of Gratian and of the new 'science,' as it was termed, of Canon Law.

'The errors,' observes Mgr. Nardi, 'in which the *Decretum* was involved became through its vast authority yet more pernicious. Besides the false citations of which we have spoken, a much greater injury was the gathering together the false decretals and the ima-

[1] Pancirollus ap. Mastricht, p. 327.

ginary councils of the Middle Ages, chiefly scattered throughout the pages of the pseudo-Isidore' (p. 79).

It is remarkable to hear a great Ultramontane ecclesiastic thus speak of the ladder which assisted the Popes to mount to the summit of their power. But the evidence which it every now and then presents of the differences of doctrine and rite which exist between modern and mediæval Romanism, and which the Jesuit Turrianus, the champion of the forged decretals, had not the acuteness to perceive, may well account for the repudiation in our own day of what was so useful to the Papacy in an earlier one. The work of Gratian consists of three principal parts.

I. The first is divided into 101 *distinctions* and canons, and treats on the principles of law, the sources of law, and the rights and duties of ecclesiastical persons.

II. The second, which treats specially on the tribunals and legal processes of the Church, is divided into thirty-six *causes*, branching out into questions which are again subdivided into canons. To this is appended a treatise on Repentance (or Penance), whose authenticity as the work of Gratian has been sometimes disputed.

III. The third part (on Consecration) relates to sacred objects and actions, and, as it includes the laws and extracts on the Sacraments, is perhaps the most generally interesting of the three great divisions of the *Decretum*.

Now, when we consider that in the *Corpus J. C.* we have first the text of the canons and documents cited, then the observations of Gratian himself upon them, and finally the numerous *paleæ* which crept gradually into the text, and that in all the earlier editions of the code there is an almost hopeless confusion of these separate elements, we cannot but regard with gratitude as well as amazement the labours of Dr. Friedberg, who for the first time has separated the chaff from the wheat in this vast magazine, and enabled us to discriminate between the actual text of Gratian, his own remarks, and the later glosses of his commentators. Gregory IX., in A.D. 1234, added those subsequent constitutions called after himself the Gregorian; while what is termed the *Sixth Book of Decretals* was added by Boniface VIII. (A.D. 1300.) In 1305–14 the code received a new accession in the decretals of Clement V., while John XXII. closed the heterogeneous compilation with what are called the *Extravagantes Communes*. In these some later constitutions were afterwards inserted, bringing down its history to 1483, the very birth-year of its great adversary, Luther. Thus was formed this

remarkable code, whose inconsistency is such that every successive accretion derogates, as Mgr. Nardi admits,[1] from that which precedes it; the Extravagants from the Clementines, the Clementines from the Sixth Book, that again from the Gregorians, and all together from the *Decretum* itself. It gave a legal and practical form to all those monarchical principles which were perfected by Gregory VII., and are summarized in his famous *Dictates*, and exhibits the stages by which the ancient aristocratic and synodical organization of the Church was changed into an absolute monarchy.

We have before us in the later Decretals and Extravagants some of the most celebrated of the assertions of this autocratic power, as in the Constitutions *Unigenitus*, *Ambitiosæ*, and many others, framed in accordance with the above-named *Dictates* of Gregory VII., in one of which (contrary to the doctrine of Gratian at an earlier place in the code) the Pope is invested with impeccability as well as infallibility. The chapter, *Si Papa Suæ* had, however, admitted the possibility of his becoming a heretic, though it made him incapable of being judged by anyone. Yet these singular illustrations of the ignorance of the age are but the waifs and strays floating along the stream of this turbid legislation. Its deeper waters, the principles of law, and especially of litigation, which it develops in its course, are found again in the civil laws of almost every country in Europe, and render the study of it as important in a legal as in a historical point of view. The authority of this code (writes Mastricht) increased and decreased from time to time. When the Empire of the Roman Pontiffs spread itself over the whole West, and lifted itself even over the Emperors, the authority of the Canon Law was spread in the same degree, so that Gratian places the Decretals among the canonical writings and makes disobedience to them a sin against the Holy Ghost. Gradually, and not a little assisted by the careless toleration and even connivance of the Emperors and other princes, the Canon Law was received in every kingdom of Europe, and where the civil or other law failed or was silent was adopted to supply the defect. This was specially the case in France and Spain, and also in Hungary and in England. In Germany it was ever held that cases not clearly decided in the Civil Law might be cleared up and interpreted by the Canon Law where it was clearer. Where the two laws were contrary to each other, the secular code was allowed to rule in the civil, the Canon Law in the ecclesiastical tribunal.

[1] Nardi, *Elementi*, pp. 86, 87.

But the influence of the Canon Law upon the complicated systems of law in England, whether civil or religious, was even greater than that which it obtained in the Latin nations, where the Justinian code so long preserved its ascendency. We can hardly estimate the extent to which our own unwritten laws, embodied in later ages in so many judicial decisions and resting on so many early precedents, is indebted to this Canon Law, at least for the principles and rules upon which it is based. It has been significantly noted that very many of the decretals are addressed to English churches and arise out of English controversies. The constant references to Rome of ecclesiastical questions, and the commissions and delegations sent into England to solve them, lead us to conclude that its influence must have been vast indeed during the period in which our laws were in process of formation. But it may perhaps be asked, 'How can a system of laws based on forgeries now universally exploded, and designed to build up an autocracy upon which even the more learned and moderate of the Roman Church would impose some kind of constitutional restraint, be of any use or value to the Protestant world?' To this we might reply that Protestant princes, when they abjured the Roman obedience, nevertheless retained those forms of law and methods of procedure which had been adopted from the old Canon Law, just as the princes of Europe when they renounced the power of the Emperors preserved the laws of the Empire, which had been so long established in their kingdoms.

Hence the Canon Law is interwoven with our English laws as well as with the civil laws of the Empire, while the decrees and capitulars of the sovereigns of Europe are incorporated into its code. It cannot but be seen from this that the knowledge of its history and structure must be of the greatest value to the student of our complex system of law, while in regard to our ecclesiastical law the code in question possesses even now a recognized authority and a living power. In the frequent controversies which have unhappily distracted our Church it is still cited in cases which our own ecclesiastical laws have left undecided; nor is there any form or usage in the Church which cannot trace its origin or find its explanation in that great body of laws which is now placed before us in its clearest and most perfect form. For we must bear in mind the fact that while the Reformation made the most organic changes in ritual and doctrine as they had been developed in the Roman Church, it left the entire legal framework of the mediæval system unchanged. The place of the

final tribunal of appeal was changed, but the principles which had regulated it remained the same. In almost all the appeals on Church matters which have come before the Privy Council we find the advocates on either side falling back upon Lyndwood and the other summarists of the Canon Law, and even in the obscurer realm of ritual there have been constant references to this venerable code. In the all-important question of the ultimate tribunal of appeal the attention of the Commission was specially directed to the practice on this subject before the Reformation and under the ancient Canon Law, and evidence on this point was given by Canon Jenkins, on the invitation of the late Archbishop of Canterbury and of the Bishop of Winchester. The very forms of inquiry which are directed by the Bishops to commissions of clergy in our own day are identical with those enjoined under the older Canon Law; and the writer of these lines has in his possession an original commission of this kind issued in 1349, to determine a question of patronage during the vacancy of the See of Canterbury. There is, in fact, no case which can arise under the ecclesiastical law, unless the statute law has interposed, in which the influence and importance of the study of the Canon Law is not apparent. It may well, therefore, be hoped that the opportunity now offered both to the lawyer and divine may not be lost, and that the lifelong labours of Dr. Friedberg may find their reward in the increasing number of those who desire to avail themselves of his guidance through the maze of error and confusion which has daunted so many from a study of the greatest historical as well as doctrinal interest. For it must be remembered that, debased and corrupted as it became, the Canon Law has yet been the channel along which (in its *regulæ juris* and more general principles) the most practical laws of the Justinian code have mingled themselves with our early legislation. Much even of that unwritten law which is peculiar to English jurisprudence and forms the basis of the Common Law is derived from this now neglected code, and belongs to that primitive period when the intervention or arbitration of the clergy had so supreme an influence in settling private contentions. On all these grounds we may well put up a plea for its revived study and look forward to the time when the titles of LL.D. or of *Juris utriusque Doctor* shall become a reality, and the terror of Rome no longer daunt us from a pursuit which added to these legitimate degrees the more doubtful one of 'Doctor in the Decretals.'

ART. III.—OUR LORD'S HUMAN EXAMPLE.

1. *The Gospel for the Nineteenth Century.* Fourth edition. (London, 1880.)
2. *Christ our Ideal: an Argument from Analogy.* By the Author of *The Gospel for the Nineteenth Century.* (London, 1882.)
3. *The Manliness of Christ.* By THOMAS HUGHES, Q.C. Second edition. (London, 1880.)
4. *Jesus Christ: His Life and Work.* By the REV. P. A. MALLESON, M.A. (London, 1882.)

THE present generation is producing a great number of books from all sorts of doctrinal platforms about our Lord's human life, character, and example. We have books written out of the heart of the Catholic Church, which we need not enumerate, and books or pamphlets (like some of Keshub Chunder Sen's Calcutta Lectures, which have excited interest in this country) from a position wholly external to historical Christianity. In between these extreme limits some of these books, like Renan's *Life of Jesus*, have a mainly destructive result, and represent deliberate attempts to substitute for the accepted Christ of the Church an almost new figure as the Christ of history. Then there are books of mainly critical interest, like Bishop Ellicott's lectures on our Lord's Life; there are many treatments of the Life of Christ, like Mr. Malleson's book, the title of which stands at the head of this article, of the more broadly historical order; and lastly there are books of the class which it is in the main our present task to deal with—books with a primarily practical and moral aim. The present generation needs conspicuously enough, in its half-disintegrated condition, a steady standard of human conduct and fixed ideal of human life. The one Life which has a claim to give or be this, which no generation can do without, is the Life of Jesus Christ. This our authors feel. It is, they believe, true of the present age that 'all men seek' Christ, whether their need be conscious or unconscious, and believing this they have this noble aim before them, nothing less than to re-erect the standard of Christ's Life as the practical guide for men living in the world. But then the authors we are to deal with have this peculiarity: that though they are believers in Christ and speak as such, they yet with

more or less of emphasis regard the full Catholic doctrine of Christ's Person as an encumbrance in the presentation of Christ's human example to their contemporaries. They are not in violent revolt from it; they could not echo M. Renan's assurance of consolation in membership of 'that invisible Church which includes the excommunicated saints, the choice souls of every age—the banished who are always the true elect.'[1] They are not in violent revolt from orthodoxy, some of them perhaps not in *revolt* at all: but they regard doctrinal orthodoxy as an encumbrance, as a weight which hangs about a man's neck and prevents him from presenting with freedom what we may call the case for Christ. If we can rid the presentation of Christ, as the Master of human life, of the shackles of dogma, we shall obtain for it (they feel) a readier hearing, a readier acceptance. More men will be Christians, and Christianity will be as powerful as ever. In this sense the writers whose books stand at the head of this article are more or less hostile to Catholic theology about the Person of Christ. It asks too much, they think: more than is necessary for working Christianity. Such a plea cannot but be worth consideration. Undoubtedly it is our duty to 'minimize dogma' in the sense of not enlarging the dogmatic requirement beyond the point of what is necessary for preserving the sources of corporate Christian life intact. But the Church claims that nothing short of her doctrine about Christ's Person is really adequate as a practical and permanent basis for Christian life. The dogma claims to be neither irrational nor unpractical, and our task in this present article is to vindicate the Church's dogmatic teaching about the Person of Christ as the most adequate and intelligible basis for an efficient presentation of Christ's example. These writers, we believe, who profess to remove encumbrance and bring Christ's example closer to men, in easier and more natural relation to their ordinary lives, are really sapping the foundations of the power of Christ to reconstruct and renovate human life at all. Bringing Christ nearer to men, as they believe, in effect they remove Him further off and make Him an unintelligible figure in human history.

Can we justify this impeachment of a modern method of dealing with Christ which is highly popular at the present day? Can we justify our claim that only through the Catholic conception of Christ's Person is His example really brought into profitable and intelligible relation to our working lives?

[1] *Les Apôtres*, Introduction, p. lxi.

This we proceed to attempt, and we will begin constructively, not critically, by showing what place Christ's example *does* hold in the Church's theology. Then we shall have a standard with which to compare the presentations of Christ's example in the modern books which we wish to criticize.

Wishing to show how unique, how 'supernatural,' is the mode in which Christ's example affects us, we cannot do better than begin by emphasizing the limits of the power of example on the natural basis.

For one man's example to have a stimulating effect on another it is essential that the two should be living under similar conditions of life. The same sum of forces must be felt to be at work on both lives within and without. There must be, broadly speaking, no force which the one can draw upon, but which the other knows to be closed to him. The broad meaning of life and struggle must be the same to both. Thus the respectable clergyman's example in resisting the attractions of the public house, or of drink in his family, has no power on the working man who finds in drink a fatal snare. The good example is powerless, because it does not start from sufficiently similar conditions of life to those under which the man lives whom it is desired to influence. Even in the same rank or outward condition of life a too great gulf between the moral tone of men tends to prevent the influence of one from acting on the other by way of example. If a saint has influence over a sinner it is rather the influence of moral authority, of strength over weakness, than the influence properly described as that of example.[1] Even radical differences of disposition neutralize the force of example, because the balance of forces which go to make up life seems so conspicuously different in one man and the other. It is only emphasizing this same fact in a slightly different aspect to say that the power of real genius acknowledged in another neutralizes the influence of his example, intellectually and morally. By genius we mean something innate, peculiar, incommunicable, something which, at our best, we feel that we can admire but not imitate. If we have set down Shakspeare as a genius, the idea of imitating him becomes the last conception which occurs to us. When we feel in another an incommunicable gift of sympathy, we admire his power of influencing those who come about him, but we also in equal degree feel ourselves exempt from all sense of shortcoming in not doing the like. Once again, the influence of example

[1] Except of course so far as the saint can speak *as himself a converted sinner*, an exception which does not apply to our present argument.

depends on conditions of time and place. A man of another race, a hero of long ago, does not inspire us to imitate his nobleness, unless we feel some closer bond of connection with him than comes from our common humanity, from the very fact that he does not suggest to us an adequate representation of our own lives and moral struggles under the far-off guise of his foreign life. And it seems important for us to recognize that these limitations on the force of human example are emphasized by the tendency of evolutionist philosophy. Of course a fatalist philosophy *annihilates* the power of example. We cannot help being what we are. But short of this an evolutionist conception of life reduces the limits, within which it holds true that 'what man has done man can do,' by the fact that it gives a less determinate and fixed meaning to the term humanity. Within the area of the species the process of differentiation is perpetually going on. 'Original sin' is a fact which evolutionist philosophy is bound to recognize: but it recognizes it not as a fixed quantum; but as an inherent defect or disorder in human nature, which obeys the laws of hereditary descent, which ebbs and flows, which is developed and augmented by indulgence in one generation and stayed by moral self-restraint in another. Again, evolution makes the most of the influence of distinctions of race on the foundations of moral character. Humanity is in all respects a more differentiated thing, within the area of which we can argue less glibly from one specimen to another and draw inductions less freely from capacities exhibited in one quarter to faculties existing in another. This, once recognized, conditions the moral power of example, and emphasizes those limitations on the force of example which we were alluding to above.

As the consequence of all this we recognize that the power of example is greatest where it is most 'contagious;' when it passes from one to another over an area of life where the same conditions obtain, and the same moral atmosphere prevails. It is in a regiment of soldiers, in the crew of a ship, among the students of a college, among the members of a profession closely linked by common interests, cares, and sympathies—it is under such circumstances that example has its maximum force, because the conditions of life are especially uniform. If all this be, as we believe, obviously true, it is apparent that our appeal to Christ's example labours at first sight under every possible disadvantage. Christ's human life appears, that is to say, to have been lived under conditions, internal and external, as unlike those of

the ordinary Englishman's as any life which can be called human.

But it may be urged, and truly urged, against this, that the appeal to Christ's example is not an appeal to imitate His kind of life, but an appeal to live in the spirit of His life, which is universal: not an appeal to do as He did, but to be as He was in His relations to God and man. And it is here, when we reach the foundations of life, the very fundamental motives and springs of action, that we get to that in which the real unity of human life consists. It is here that 'the truly great have all one age, and time is not with them.' It is here in the central conceptions and motives which determine life that Christ's example may be ours. Christ appeals to us to view life as He viewed it, and live it in the spirit in which He lived it.

But here again the old difficulty presents itself, only moved further back. When a conception of life is set before us which we are required to assimilate and make our own, we require at starting some reasonable ground of conviction that the fundamental relations to God and man which it involves will be attainable by us as we are. Otherwise the conception will remain to us a mere imaginative or notional one, which we cannot even imperfectly realize in experience, because it does not at the basis correspond to the facts of our life. A conception of life is worse than useless if it does not either appeal to facts of our present experience or supply the conditions of its own realization. The Platonic conception, in the Symposium, of the life of union with the Divine is lofty, but, from the point of view of our more awakened consciences, merely notional, because it lies side by side with the vilest moral facts and with tendencies of life most antagonistic to Divine influences, practically accepted and acquiesced in. Thus it is to us profitless, because it makes no appeal to the conscience and does not stir the will. It is an idea, not a moral basis of life.

Thus the conception of life which Christ's presents to us in His own Person, though realized in Himself, does not appeal to us, but runs the risk of remaining either a mere intellectual idea, like the Platonic, or a moral ideal which rebukes us by contrast, but does not elevate, unless it can become effectual for us by starting from our own level, which is just what at first sight and on the natural basis it does not do. A conception of life, such as that which Christ gives us of His own life, which involves a perfect relation to God, a cloudless spiritual atmosphere of Divine moral certitude, an absolute

incapacity for moral obliquity, an utter ignoring of sin within, is unintelligible and unreal to us as a basis of life, unless it stands to us in some relation as supernatural as its own conditions seem to be. We are told, indeed, of growth in Christ, of a natural development of His human nature, in wisdom as in stature; but as we look at His life we can see no trace of His 'getting better,' no sign of moral improvement or of there being any place for it; no sign of His finding it at any time hard to be good or easy to sin. He could indeed feel and even quail before the burden of what obedience involved: but no sign can we see of any, even momentary, hesitation in obeying the law of God, whatever it might involve. Now, a man who never had to 'get better' in the sense of overcoming sin is one who is separated from us by an infinite gulf in moral experience. We cannot understand the zeal with which (at the risk of disastrous theological consequences) people contend for a Christ capable of sin—a Christ who could have sinned, but did not. On the mere natural level a Christ *actually* sinless, *actually* free from the whole taint of sin, is lifted as much out of the fellowship of ordinary moral experience as the Christ of the Church's theology. Judged by the ordinary laws of induction, the actual sinlessness of Christ is as distinctly supernatural a fact as His resurrection, as distinctly transcending experience and placing Christ on a supernatural level.[1]

The anticipations about Christ's example which such reflections as these would suggest are confirmed by the evidence of the actual results of Christ's human life.

As a matter of fact Christ seems to have drawn and influenced by authority rather than by example. Example is contagious; it inspires most in its immediate neighbourhood; it influences by proximity. There must, then, be something unique about the example of one who could really influence only by bodily absence. How feeble the power of Christ's present example on the Apostles before His departure, as compared with the moulding energy of His Spirit after Pentecost! He did not communicate the inspiration of His life as a Savonarola, or a Luther, or a S. Francis did. Viewed as an example to His own race, His life as a Prophet on earth was, we may reverently say, a wonderful failure. The 'corn of wheat,' not being fertilized by death, remained alone. He died almost without faithful followers. The Jewish race was the worse for His teaching in the mass. Over His actual disciples His influence had been slight by comparison

[1] See Mozley's 'Of Christ Alone without Sin,' in *Lectures*, &c., recently published.

with what it was to be. They had not understood, still less realized, His conception of life. Thus He had made even the innermost circle feel more the constraint of loving authority and the indefinite enlargement of spiritual horizon than the inspiration of example; and it was only in the inner circle, in connection with ministerial work and in the atmosphere of teaching about the Holy Ghost, that He spoke of example at all.

It is starting from considerations and facts like these that the Church builds up her conception of Christ's Person, and of the place of His example in the general scheme of redemption. In doing this she may seem at first sight to take Christ further from us, to increase the gap between Him and us: but she does so only to bring Him nearer to us in closest union and most vital efficacy of human influence. In treating, then, of the revelation of the Christ, we begin by drawing a distinction between the order of Christ's manifestation and the order of His nature. In manifestation Christ is first man, then God. This is the order in which in the main the Synoptic Gospels present Him to us. We see Him as Man among men; only slowly, gradually, behind the manhood do we become impressed with the presence of the Lord of all. This is how, in fact, he manifested Himself to His Apostles. Attached to Him as to a human Teacher or Master, they grow to find themselves more and more in an attitude towards His authority, in an utter subordination of faith to Him, which involves, if it is not to be idolatrous, that He is more than man. In His tone they hear speaking the Divine authority, and, more than this, the Divine jealousy, which will not brook a rival claim or put up with a divided allegiance.[1] They hear Him claim to be what God alone is, the adequate repose and satisfaction of the human heart. They hear Him speak as the final Judge of all men, and as granting to men the pardon which it is the Divine prerogative to bestow.[2] Thus gradually the Apostles come to find themselves in a moral attitude towards Christ which involves His Divinity. The belief in His Divinity grows out of an acquaintance with the character of His humanity. It was not a sudden revelation, but a gradual experience. 'Whom do ye say that I, the Son of Man, am?' Christ asked of those who had known Him most closely? And the reply breaks out—the instinctive, slowly-growing attitude of devotion toward Christ finding for the

[1] S. Matt. vii. 29, viii. 27, xi. 27, xiv. 33; S. Mark, i. 27; S. Luke, xiv. 26.
[2] S. Matt. xi. 28–30, vii. 22, ix. 2.

first time clear intelligent utterance—'Thou art the Son of the living God!'

Thus He is manifested as the Man born of the seed of David according to the flesh before He is declared to be the Son of God with power.

'Why,' asks S. Chrysostom, 'did S. Paul thus, in speaking of Christ, begin from this side, the lower, and not from the other, the higher end? Because Matthew began thence, and Luke, and Mark. For he that would lead men by the hand to heaven must needs lead them upward from below. And so, in fact, the matter was transacted. First they saw Him as Man upon earth, then they perceived Him to be God.'[1]

This is the order of revelation. But the order of origin is the opposite. The Godhead recognized behind the manhood is not recognized as a thing distinct from Christ, but as *what He is*; not as something into which He grew, but as something out of which He spoke, and moved, and acted. It is the mode of action in humanity which is at length discerned to be new to Him, not the Divine Existence. Thus the Synoptists assume behind their account, as prior to it in order of logic, though posterior in order of revelation, the account of Christ's Person which S. John gives: 'The Word was made flesh.' It is the order of His nature. He who was eternally God becomes Man; He enters into a new condition of life. He *becomes* Man. Remaining God, he takes into Himself the nature of man. Everything that belongs to man He takes; every part, every faculty, spiritual or physical, every sense, passion, feeling, all He takes into Himself and lives in them for evermore. And He takes them not as isolated parts or detached faculties, but in the proper organic unity of a human nature, one in itself under the control of a human will. But it was a human nature which had no separate existence before its union with the Godhead. It began to exist in God. It had no independent centre of personality in itself; it finds its personality in the first moment of its existence in the eternal personal life of the Son of God. 'The Word was made flesh.' He took the manhood into God. He appeared on earth, as personally the Son of God, in a perfect human nature which He had made His own.

In this conception of Christ's Person is bound up His impeccability. Christ, of course, had every faculty of human nature, everything that man sins with, and therefore every instrument or faculty of sin. He could have sinned, if He

[1] S. Chrysostom on Rom. i. 3.

had willed:[1] what He could not do, by the very constitution of His nature, was to *will* to sin, to choose the evil. To choose evil even with His human will must have involved a centre of independent personality in His human nature which would have made Christ not one person, but two. Being One, and personally God, He could not have willed to sin. No doubt there is a 'quiescence'[2] of the Divine nature which we may delight to recognize in those hours when Christ's kinship with the innocent weaknesses of our flesh is most prominent: no doubt we must recognize that the light of the Divine Presence and Knowledge could be shut off, at least temporarily, from His human nature, so as to leave it ignorant at one time of a Divine secret, and 'forsaken' at another of Divine consolation—God forbid,[3] indeed, that we should explain away Christ's own words, or seek to do the impossible, and imagine to ourselves the conditions of Christ's consciousness![4]—but after all such concessions this at least may be certainly postulated: Christ could not have sinned without ceasing to be what He is—God.[5]

In thus asserting the impeccability of Christ we must guard ourselves from two possible misconceptions.

1. We continue to maintain that Christ was really tempted, really put to the proof. There is no justification for confusing capacity for being *tried* by evil suggestions with capacity for yielding to them. Christ had a real Human nature, really put to the proof, and found not wanting. Evil suggestions were really presented to Him, and He had real human faculties for them to make their appeal to; but, as His nature was in no way disordered, the faculties moved not one whit towards the object of desire, except in subordination to the will; and

[1] 'Christus hanc cupiditatem vitiorum *et sentire posset, si haberet, et habere, si vellet*; sed absit ut vellet.'—S. Aug. *Op. Imperfect. c. Julian.* iv. 48.

[2] S. Irenæus, iii. 19. 3, ἡσυχάζοντος τοῦ Λόγου ἐν τῷ πειράζεσθαι καὶ σταυροῦσθαι.

[3] Cf. Dr. Mill's admirable sermons *On the Nature of Christianity*, p. 18. The passion for system in theology requires restraint by the reverent acceptance of mystery.

[4] The faculty of 'imaginatio,' the faculty of drawing a mental picture of any state of existence, is limited by our own possible experience. We can draw no mental picture whatever of a dog's consciousness—none, that is, that has any valid claim to represent the fact.

[5] Thus most writers who deny the impeccability do so on a Nestorian basis, by postulating for the humanity in Christ a possible independence of the Divinity. M. Godet most strangely, however, says (*S. Luc.* i. p. 276), 'Le Fils pouvait pécher, puisqu'il avait renoncé au mode d'être Divin.' Surely *dormitat Homerus.* God becoming untrue to Himself: ceasing to be holy!

the human will of Christ could not, in virtue of its essential relation to God, assent to what was not of God. Human nature thus, in its new relation to God in Christ, was found beyond the power of evil, incapable of failing under trial. But He was really tempted.

2. His human will, moreover, was really free, not in the lower and more popular sense in which freewill is taken to mean capacity to choose bad or good (which is only the condition of a free will in the early stage of probation), but in the sense in which 'freedom' is used in Scripture or the higher moralists.[1] Christ's rejection of evil involved a real moral choice. His will was free in rejecting it: that is, it was determined from within by the law of its own being, the law of subordination to the Divine Will, not from without by the pressure of passion or external motives overruling its internal law. Thus, not to pause on the subject, the freedom of Christ's will was like the freedom of the will of the blessed in heaven, where they have lost the capacity for preferring evil to good, and serve God with a 'perfect freedom.' 'We are not,' says S. Augustine, in the noble peroration to his *City of God*[2]—

'we are not to suppose that, because sin shall have no power to delight them, freewill must be withdrawn. It will, on the contrary, be all the more truly free, because set free from delight in sinning. For the first freedom of will which man received when he was created upright consisted in an ability not to sin, but also in an ability to sin; whereas this last freedom shall be superior, inasmuch as it shall not be able to sin. This, indeed, shall not be a natural ability, but the gift of God. For it is one thing to be God, another thing to be partaker of God. God by nature cannot sin, but the partaker of God receives this inability from God.'

Christ, then, was impeccable. The Church boldly faces it. She meets the half-irritable demand, 'Of what use to me, then, is Christ's example in resisting temptation if you tell me He could not have sinned?' by the rejoinder that it is very possible it would have been no use to us—that at any rate we cannot estimate what its value would have been to us—if His work upon us had stopped with example. But it did not. It was only the first stage of His work that, as very

[1] Cf. Kant's definition of freedom as '*autonomy, the property of the will to be a law to itself.*' It is not what all men have, but what all men *ought to aim at*, and can by grace acquire.

[2] Book xxii. cap. 30 (Clarke's translation); cf. Thomassinus, *De Dogm. Theol.* vol. i., 'De Incarn. Verbi,' v. capp. x. xii. xiii.; cf. Canon Wordsworth's *University Sermons*, p. 80; cf. *Ecce Homo*, cap. xiii.

God in human nature, Christ lived on earth a perfect human life. It was a perfect—nay, more, it was a universal—human life in all its aspects of work and prayer, of waiting and action, at home and abroad, in popularity and ignominy, with poor and with rich, in success and failure, through all the stages of human growth. He passed through the great trials which prove man, unscathed, invincible, not as being in 'a state of probation' toward God, but as exhibiting the type and example of perfect human life. It would have been an example of despair if it had been nothing more: a splendid image of what human life might be under conditions other than those in which we live. But He did not stop with the work of example. To the example, in perfect correspondence of teaching and action, succeeds the second stage—the work of propitiation. He offers on the Cross the sacrifice which, once offered and accepted in glory, lives for ever, and makes it possible for God, without doing violence to, or obscuring the revelation of, His righteousness and justice, to forgive man freely and easily. But, again, His work does not stop here. An example based on conditions of life truly human, but not ours, as we now are—a sacrifice which, obtaining remission of past sins, left us still as weak as we were for the future, infusing no new life into us—these together would not have effected for us any real redemption from the power of sin. But the human nature of Christ is raised by the Spirit of God into the resurrection Might. Spiritualized, quickened with new capacities of life, but not *dehumanized*, the God-accepted, God-united Humanity is lifted to the Divine Glory, to be thence, as the Second Adam, through the ministry of the Spirit, the Source of regenerating, recreating, life to His Body, the Church. The Holy Ghost, proceeding, as in eternity so in time, from the Father through the Son, comes down at Pentecost, 'not to supply the absence, but to accomplish the presence' of the Incarnate Lord, the Man Christ Jesus. The avenues of communication between heaven and earth are open:[1] the powers of the God-united Humanity are made available for us men through the Spirit. The life of the Incarnate has not vanished from the earth; it is perpetuated through spiritual channels in the race of the redeemed.

Thus the Church has declined to regard the incarnate life of Christ as a coherent and intelligible thing except in

[1] The revealed conditions of Christ's humanity are the conditions of ours in Him (S. Matt. iii. 16; S. John i. 51). The προσαγωγή, the approach to God, is ours, the open avenue of inquiry (1 S. Peter iii. 21, Eph. ii. 18).

relation to the ministry of the Spirit; and she declines to regard the ministry of the Spirit as a substitute for an absent Christ, instead of a means for perpetuating Christ's living presence. The work of the Spirit is to make His servants members of Christ's Body: that is, to make Christ present inwardly in their lives, by a mode of presence which is spiritual, and therefore essentially real and vital. Thus the Christ working within in spiritual recreative energy corresponds to the same Christ who has manifested Himself without in visible example. Christ's example is efficacious, not to the world, but to His new race. To them He is an example of profit, because having set the ideal in embodied reality of word and deed before their eyes, the ideal of a life God-accepted, perfect in its relation to God and man, He then goes on, by inward presence, to recreate the lives of His members into actual conformity to the example which he has shown them outwardly. The aim of Christ's incarnation was moral: it was to recreate human character into the image of God; it was to make man fit for heaven, adequate to the vision of God. This practical moral work is done in stages. First the ideal of the perfect life is manifested, the standard of true humanity re-erected for evermore before the eyes of man; then the encumbrance of past sins, dragging down the soul which would aspire after the great Pattern of Divine Sonship in human life, is removed by the Atoning Sacrifice; lastly, the coping-stone of this great scheme of redemption is found in the Sacramental system of spiritual efficacy by which Christ, the Man Jesus, glorified and exalted, gaining admittance into human lives, reproduces in them inwardly, as the Second Adam, the life which he lived outwardly in the flesh. Christ is 'the Second Adam,' not because of His example outside us, but because He is what Adam is—a new source of human life. He is the Second Adam because the Christian, member of the redeemed race, can look to His example in outward history, and know that that same Jesus whom he sees outwardly he possesses inwardly. Thus we grow to understand the Christian conception of the Incarnation as not an isolated manifestation of an unearthly life which comes and shows itself and is gone. Christ took human life into oneness with God in order to propagate that human life. The 'new Man,' like the 'old man,' exhibits Himself as a self-propagating Type, self-propagating by its own laws, 'having its seed in itself,' like every lower form or stage of life which had yet appeared. Christ's life is supernatural; it is not to be accounted for as the result of

the lower forces hitherto manifested in the world. God did a new thing, more emphatically than He had done a new thing when, in the midst of the inorganic world, the germs of organic life appeared, or when, in the midst of the animal world, rational man first thought and wondered and worked and worshipped. God did a new thing when Christ, a Being supernatural from the point of view of all stages of life below Him, came into the world. But this supernatural nature of Christ was manifested in order to be propagated, like lower natures, but by its own laws. 'The Word was made Flesh,' to be through His flesh the Source of a new race of men restored into the image of God, and lifted into consummated union with Him. Christ, then, is the Redeemer and the Consummator of manhood, because He is both outward example and atoning sacrifice and inward grace.

Thus conceiving of Christ we get an adequate *motive* for the Incarnation. Had man been capable of being lifted by example, a holy saint might have lifted man. Had he needed but propitiation, who can say that an Incarnation was really necessary? But if human life needed inward and radical restoration, and to be made (what man had never been) one with God, then we can see why it should have been that 'God should have been made human, that we in Him should be made Divine.'

It is worth while to dwell a little from this point of view on the *universality* of Christ's human nature. The Church conceives of Christ as summing up all human nature in Himself. He has in Himself the totality of human faculties. Thus, when we conceive of Christ as a renovating principle of life to a new race, we apprehend that in the universality of Christ's character lies hid, as in a germ, the catholicity of the Church. Universal human life alone is capable of educing, developing, manifesting all the rich treasury of human excellence which is in Christ. The life of an individual saint derives its virtue from Christ, but its individuality, its idiosyncrasy, conditions the Christ-life which it manifests. It exhibits it but in one aspect. It requires all sorts of human dispositions, the universal communion of saints, to represent the whole Christ. The whole body of the saints is as the prism which breaks up and manifests in separation all the rays of glory which diverge out of the central all-embracing white light of the Sun of Righteousness.

And what is true of individual saints is true of local and national Churches. The catholic life of Christ can never be manifested in all the full complexity of its capacities till all

nations are gathered into the Church. The Jewish race showed something of what lay hid in Christ, but the Jewish Christian life was narrow and confined. The intellectual capacities of the Greek race, again, apprehended and expressed the treasures of wisdom and knowledge which lay hid in Christ. The governing capacities of the Latin race developed, in its turn, the imperial and disciplinary faculties of the Christian life. But not with these races is the Church satisfied. Each race finds something in Christ which no other race can find, something corresponding to its peculiar God-given temperament and faculties. This it is its function to apprehend. This aspect of the Incarnate Life it must assimilate and develop. To do this is its duty to the Universal Church. All the treasures which lie hid in Christ's humanity require the elect of all races to educe and reveal them. The true catholicity of the Church in all its fulness will never be manifested till every race, through its own Church, has combined to expand into a fulness of meaning the latent capacities which the Eternal Life, made flesh, transfused into the human nature which He took.

This doctrine of the immanence of Christ in His Church, as the Life of her life, is so prominent in the New Testament that it is wonderful how it can ever have been obscured. S. Paul, 'the Christ-bearing man,' as S. Athanasius loved to call him, is full of it. He knew Christ not after the flesh, as one man among many, but as Christ within, into whom he had been baptized, on whose Body and Blood he fed, in whose Life he lived, with whose Spirit he was anointed and fulfilled—Christ in us the Hope of glory, Christ being formed in us, growing within us into the measure of the fulness of His stature. So S. Paul knew Him; and the Church to S. Paul, with all its inadequacy, is, in virtue of its relation to Christ, all that Christ in His humanity is, the fulness of Him who filleth all in all. This is the mighty truth. All that Christ in His humanity is, we, His Body, are in Him. All that Christ in His humanity can do, we through Him, each in our own order as members of the Body, can do too. Christ's priesthood, which inheres in His humanity, is ours in Him. Even Christ's omnipotence over evil, Christ's incapacity for sin, is ours so far as we are His. 'He that is born of God,' S. John says, 'cannot sin, for his seed abideth in him:' that is, so far as he is true to what, as a new man in Christ, he has, the Christian has within him a force which is literally beyond the reach of sin; and if he sin, as he does so frequently, it is because, in the hour of his temptation, he draws not on the new Adam, but on the old.

Once again, this truth of the immanent Christ, as the Soul of the Church's life, and as that which makes Christ's example a reality to her and His life the rule of hers, is part of the common heritage of the Church. It breathes in S. Ignatius's fiery holiness, as 'God-bearer' he speaks to his fellows, and stands before Trajan having Christ in his breast. It is the animating principle of Tertullian's vigorous logic as he grasps and emphasizes the doctrine of Christ's Person as 'the Church's Man.'[1] It is the atmosphere in which S. Augustine lives—this truth that the Church is part of Christ, that the 'whole Christ' is not in the Head only, but 'in the Head and the members.' It is the truth which antagonism to Arianism made even more prominent in S. Athanasius, that the central aim of the Incarnation is to perpetuate in us the God-united life of Christ.

The dogmatic decisions of the Œcumenical Councils may, indeed, be regarded as simple necessities to guard this doctrine of the Second Adam. Christ must be absolutely God; otherwise in becoming incorporate with Him we should not really be made one with the Source and End of our being. Here is the justification of the Nicene Creed. Christ must have all parts of our human nature, must be completely Man; for our whole nature needs renewing, and what shall renew it save the whole humanity of Christ? Hence the condemnation of Apollinaris. Christ once again must be permanently and for ever distinctly Man; for it is here and now that fallen men need from the high heaven a true Humanity to be their new Life. Hence the Chalcedonian decree. Christ, lastly, must be no individual man, one of many, taken up into oneness with God —two persons, Man and God: otherwise the very individual personality of His human nature isolates Him from us and keeps Him separate. But He is the very and eternal Word, the Author of life to all men, the underlying Sustainer of all lower personalities, who has taken a human *nature* into His own Person, to quicken it with new fertilities of life, and to impart it as a common principle of restoration to the whole race of redeemed man. Here is the justification of Cyril and of Ephesus. All the decrees of the Œcumenical Councils are exempt from the charge of being pieces of unnecessary dogmatism to anyone who really appreciates what lies hid in the title of Christ, 'the Second Adam,' and the spiritual relation of Him, the Head, to us, His members.[2]

The last point to which we must call attention in our exposition of the theology of Christ's Person is the way in which

[1] *De Coronâ Militis*, 14.

[2] Cf. Westcott (*Speaker's Commentary*) on S. John i. 14.

this conception of Christ, as the immanent Source of redemptive life to His people, connects the Church's doctrine of Christ with her doctrine of human nature; and, as a consequence or correlative fact, the way in which the misconception of Christ's Person has been associated with, or prepared the way for, a misconception about human life.

The Church conceives of human nature, as we have it, as something which has gone wrong. In trying to stand alone, to be independent of God, man lost the true centre of his life. He lost the principle of order and subordination in his nature. His nature became evil—that is, inharmonious, disorderly—and disorder generated corruption and made man unfit for God. Man is 'under wrath.' Not that God has ceased to love him or has any way changed to him, but that man's nature has become inadequate to the life of God. He cannot breathe in that pure air. God's holiness is intolerable to him; he cannot lift himself to fellowship with God, because his life 'is a false nature; it is not in the harmony of things.' This is the doctrine of the Fall: that man is organically corrupt; that is, that there is the principle of disorder in the human stock self-propagating according to the natural law of descent, vitiating each specimen of the human race, prior to any actual sin, by an inherent weakness and predisposition to evil. It is from this point of view essential that man should be born again; that a new principle of life, reconstituting, reordering human nature, should be introduced into him. A new incoming of life into each man, setting his old nature right, a new Adam correcting the old Adam and restoring it: this is what is needed and this is what Christ gives. He first *regenerates* man by putting him into inward connection with the new source of life, and then gradually, by the spiritual influence of the new life, *recreates* him into His own image. Thus the doctrine of the Second Adam coheres with the doctrine of the Fall. If each man's nature was adequate to fellowship with God in virtue of the natural forces at his disposal, the 'new birth' would not have been needed. Enlightenment, example, would have been enough. If man had gone wrong in the past, indeed, some transaction securing forgiveness from God would have been needed to clear away the old score; but, 'the handwriting written against' men once effaced, all would have been well. Illuminated by the light of good example, man might have lived for the future acceptably to God. Forgiveness then for the past and example for the future might have sufficed for man not radically fallen. In effect they are the elements of Christ's work which Pelagius seems to have

recognized.[1] Now, of these, example might have been set by an unfallen saint, and forgiveness, perhaps, secured by one at least not God and man in the sense in which Christ is. Thus it comes about, as we said, that inadequate conceptions of Christ's Person go hand in hand with inadequate conceptions of what human nature wants. The Nestorian conception of Christ as practically one individual man to whom God gradually united Himself on account of his excellence—the conception of a man gradually deified—qualifies Christ for being an example of what a man can do, and into what wonderful union with God he can be assumed if he is holy enough; but Christ remains one Man among many, shut in within the limits of a single human personality, and influencing man only from outside. He can be a Redeemer of man if man can be saved from outside by bright example, but not otherwise. The Nestorian Christ is logically associated with the Pelagian man. This association of the heretical theory of Christ with the heretical theory of man is probably, through the influence upon both of Theodore of Mopsuestia, a fact of history. A fact of logic it certainly is.[2] The Nestorian Christ is the fitting Saviour of the Pelagian man. As a matter of fact, orthodox as Pelagius himself was on the Person of Christ, his leading successor got upon wrong lines in this matter too. In Augustine's final controversy with Julian of Eclanum he is contending for the fact that Christ's sinlessness is a supernatural thing, involving not merely that He controlled His disordered passions, but that He had not got disordered passions to control, because His nature was unfallen; while Julian is constrained to contend that, disordered impulses being in our present human nature to start with, they must have been in Christ's.[3] Error about our human nature had involved him in error about Christ's. Misconception of our needs involved misconception of Christ's work. This correlation of errors has continued since. Those who decline to accept the doctrine of an immanent Christ mediating salvation to us through His humanity, into which we are taken, tend to fall into one of two errors about human nature. Either they represent it as not really needing anything more than adequate instruction—that is, they Pelagianize—or else they

[1] S. Aug. *De Gratiâ Christi*, cap. 39.

[2] Cf. the strangely unpoetical epigram of Prosper in which the Nestorian heresy soliloquizes—

> 'Nestoriana lues successi Pelagianæ,
> Quæ tamen est utero prægenerata meo.'

[3] See below, p. 306.

give up human nature and represent it as gone beyond recovery in the present state, corrupt, so as to be incapable of real present restoration into God-accepted righteousness; and they go on to empty Christ's work of its real moral aim by the doctrine of Imputation, which represents God as hiding His face from our real state, and reckoning to belong to us a righteousness of Christ which, in fact, remains unshared by us. The process of redemption becomes a 'make-believe' process; we are not really restored at all.

This much of illustration must suffice to indicate the connexion between the Church's view of our fallen nature and her doctrine of Christ's Person: they are the correlatives of one another.

This has seldom been more strikingly put than in a book seldom read, but certainly, in spite of strange blemishes, deserving to be read—William Law's *Spirit of Prayer*: and with some quotations from this book we will conclude our review of the Catholic doctrine of the Person and work of Christ. Law is contending for the inward reality of the Fall and the inward reality of the new birth which we receive from Christ. But the 'seculum rationalisticum' to which he wrote regarded the doctrine of the 'Christ within raising a birth of His own nature, life, and Spirit within us . . . . as gross enthusiasm.' Thus he vindicates it with energy, eloquence, and impressive earnestness.

'One would wonder,' he says, 'how any persons that believe the great mysteries of the Redemption, who adore the depths of the Divine goodness, in that the Son of God, the second Person of the Trinity, became [a] Man Himself, in order to make it possible for man, by a birth from Him, to enter again into the kingdom of God, should yet . . . . contend for not a real but a figurative sense of a new birth in Jesus Christ.' 'Our Blessed Saviour says, "Without Me ye can do nothing." The question is when or how a man may be said to be without Christ. . . . We are "without Him" when He is no longer in us as a Principle of heavenly life, and so "can do nothing"—nothing, that is, that is good and holy. A Christ not *in us* is the same thing as a Christ *not ours*.' 'If Adam were only an outward person, if his whole nature were not our nature, born in us and derived from him into us, it were nonsense to say that his fall is our fall. So in like manner if Christ, our Second Adam, were only an outward Person, if He entered not as deeply into our nature as the first Adam does, if we have not as really from Him a new inward spiritual man as we have outward flesh and blood from Adam, what ground would there be to say that our righteousness is from Him, as our sin is from Adam? Let no one here think to charge me with disregard to the Holy Jesus, who was born of the Virgin Mary, or with setting up an inward Saviour in opposition to that outward

Christ whose history is recorded in the Gospel.' No ; it is with the utmost fulness of faith that I ascribe all our redemption to that blessed and mysterious Person . . . . and will assert no inward redemption but what wholly proceeds from and is effected by that life-giving Redeemer.'[1]

We have now stated our case. We have not so much been endeavouring to argue as to state positively the position in which the full Catholic doctrine places the example of Christ. It makes His life the example, in a sense, to man generally, but in fulness of meaning only to His new race, to His Body, the Church. To them His example occupies an intelligible position because it falls in with the other parts of a supernatural scheme by which God in Christ reconciled the world to Himself. Our contention is, then, that this scheme is coherent. It makes the phenomena of Christ's human life significant, intelligible, natural; and so leaving the positive position we pass to the negative part of our task —that of indicating that just in proportion as this Catholic conception of the scheme of salvation, and of Christ's Person as the central figure in it, is deserted, just so far the facts of Christ's human life and Christ's moral teaching become unintelligible, incoherent, even when presented by persons who are in a real sense believers in Christ.

We take first the book which is far the least orthodox of those with which we have to deal—Mr. Thomas Hughes' *Manliness of Christ.* Everyone knows that Mr. Hughes has a great enthusiasm for promoting a moral, upright, Christian life (as he understands the term); everybody knows at the same time that he is one of those who are very intolerant of dogma and who look upon Christian dogmatic teaching as little else than a hindrance to the general acceptableness of Christianity. So here we have Mr. Hughes presenting Christ to modern society in the form in which he thinks He can be most profitably presented, rid of all doctrinal encumbrances and superfluities. Here, then, we have a genuine utterance—genuine in its zeal for a manly Christian life; genuine in its contempt for the dogmatic traditions of the Christian centuries; genuine in the naïvely strenuous assurance of being right and the muscular buoyancy of conviction which always characterize Mr. Hughes' work. Christ here is presented to English working men as the Pattern of manliness. His human example is held up: that and that only is what we need. Christ must be man like us; like us, only better; better,

[1] See *Spirit of Prayer*, pp. 25–57.

but in His real Personality nothing more. On this basis alone can His example be real. So we are shown Him as the Jewish Child who, in the Temple at Jerusalem in His twelfth year, was becoming conscious of the Divine call to the Messianic work (pp. 44–49); who, in the weakness of His human nature, feeling the peril, the hopelessness, as well as the majesty, of the task, shrank back and tried every way to escape from the call to it which was haunting Him (pp. 49, 50); but yet finally rose clear above the special temptations of boyhood, and youth, and manhood, through the strength of perfect obedience. We are led to think it probable that He went to the Jordan in His thirtieth year, anticipating in His humility that He would find in John the Baptist the true Messiah rather than in Himself, and might exercise His vocation in the subordinate position of a disciple (p. 75). The expectation is dispelled. He is convinced that He only is to perform the Messianic task. He nerves Himself for the great work. He resists in the forty days' retirement in the wilderness the temptations to require miraculous outward evidences of His mission (pp. 80–84). He goes out from that struggle the pattern Man, to preach the gospel of true manhood. Perfect, spotless, was that pattern Life—higher than Luther's, Savonarola's, or Mohammed's (pp. 88, 89); for the excuses we accept for the weaknesses of ordinary men, which 'enlist our sympathy' (it is admitted) 'and make us feel the tie of a common humanity' (p. 99), we cannot admit for the pattern Man. We can make no 'allowances' for Him (p. 89). 'His life must stand the test under all circumstances and at every moment.' Why? Because He is the 'true Head of humanity, the perfect Ideal . . . . the simple Truth of God, the expression, at last, in flesh and blood, of what He who created us means each one of our race to be' (p. 152), 'the perfect Son of Man and Son of God'—'Son of God,' however, only in such sense as is consistent with his having 'only the same means as the rest of us of His becoming conscious of His relationship to God' (p. 62).

Here is Mr. Hughes' conception, so far as it concerns our present purpose, of the efficacy for us of Christ's example. And what are we to make of it? It lays itself open, we should first remark, more than such presentations usually do, to the charge of arbitrariness. Criticism is not Mr. Hughes' strong point, and in these lectures he is, no doubt, not talking critically or to a critical audience; but the arbitrariness of this presentation lies not in what is generally understood by its criticism, but in the omission from the conception of Christ's life and

tone towards His fellow men of elements which are specially prominent in the Gospels, and which one cannot omit without the most unjustifiable eclecticism. Take only four points: the tone of Christ's authoritativeness, which placed His disciples in a moral attitude towards Him such as involved them, when they tried to give it conscious expression, in a confession of His superhuman nature; His claim, which now and again breaks into His ordinary moral teaching, to be the Judge of men, the omniscient Judge; His claim to be the adequate repose and satisfaction of the sinful and toil-wearied heart of man; finally, the exclusiveness of His claim to reveal God, an exclusiveness which rings with something not less than blasphemy if it does not express the jealousy of God. These are not detached elements in Christ's teaching which can be supposed to be the additions of later reflection and misbelief; they are woven into the texture of His moral teaching. As we said above, they lift His mere moral claim at once on to a supernatural level. Waiving, then, for the moment the supernaturalness of mere sinlessness in itself, we yet impeach Mr. Hughes of the utmost arbitrariness in selecting the elements of Christ's life which he wishes to present. But passing this by and leaving the picture uncriticized, we go on further to contend that the example, as Mr. Hughes presents it, does not appeal—on the natural level, we mean—does not appeal to us; it is too high. That it should be kept on this natural level Mr. Hughes insists. If Christ becomes what we are not in His relation to God, He becomes 'no example to us' (p. 62). His very 'miracles,' which he accepts, he reduces to a natural level, making them the result of the 'sympathy with creation' which Christ possessed more perfectly than any mediæval saint, or modern naturalist, or man of science (p. 66). It may be that 'no other human being has ever approached Christ's dominion over created things,' but

'it seems to be going quite beyond what can be proved, or even fairly assumed, to speak of His [1] miracles as supernatural, in the sense that no man has ever done or can do the like.[2] The evidence is surely all the other way, and seems rather to indicate that if we could only have lived up to the standard which we acknowledge in our inmost hearts to be the true one . . . . we too should have gained the power to show signs or, if you please, to work miracles, as Christ and His Apostles worked them' (pp. 69, 70).

[1] Why, then, the capital H?

[2] The Catholic, we must remark, would not deny that other men have done the like, but that they have done the like otherwise than in a supernatural relation to Christ's nature.

Christ, then, is nothing more than a perfect natural Man, and His example appeals as a perfect example on the natural level. Let it be believed supernatural and it ceases to appeal. No, we reply. This Man, who never knew what sin was or had to overcome it *in Himself*—this Man in a perfect relation to God and to the universe of things is too unlike us to be our example. He gives us too superabundantly many excuses for failure, in our unlikeness to Him. Men for nineteen centuries, from the Apostles downward, have been moulded on His example, but that was because they believed Christ to be supernatural and to stand in that supernatural relation to them which Mr. Hughes, in boldest contradiction to the experience of Christian history, declares to be a final bar to the profitableness of example. Let that supernatural element vanish ; let the mists of theological ages be cleared away ; behind the Christ of Christian and Apostolic tradition let the true human Christ again appear ; and what, we ask, will it be likely to profit us to know that nineteen centuries ago one man, under conditions of life utterly unlike our own, lived a perfect life in Judæa ? Is this to be our comfort ? Is this the theory which is to satisfy human needs ? 'You can be quite good if you like : one man was once.' Too simple, surely, to be true ! The needs of the human soul are complex. There is nothing in modern life which has so simplified this complexity that man can be saved for the future by mere example. The sense of sin needs atonement ; the sense of inadequacy cries out for grace. Christ has corresponded to human needs not because He gave 'an example that we should do as He has done,' but because He went on to 'give His life a ransom for many,' and bade the weary and heavy-laden come to Him, that He might give them rest. So, then, the Christ whom Mr. Hughes presents differs from the Christ of S. Paul, and S. John, and S. Peter, not in being freed from the encumbrances of an extinct, or at least imperilled, theology, but in failing to correspond to the most genuine spiritual needs of man.

In this Mr. Malleson, with whose conception of Christ's Person we have now to deal, would thoroughly agree with us. Mr. Malleson takes in hand once more the task of telling the story of Christ's human life. He wishes to do the same sort of work which Dr. Farrar has done with such brilliant results, but in such a way as to bring his book within the purchasing power of the labouring classes. Accordingly we have a popular *Life of Christ*, which in its main bulk lies outside the sphere of our present critical attempt. We are

concerned only with the author's conception of the Person of Christ.

Mr. Malleson, then, claims to appear on the scene as a representative of unflinching thoroughgoing belief. 'I believe,' he says,[1] 'in the full and plenary inspiration of the Holy Scriptures; I receive every miracle in all its details and accessories; and I rejoice with thankfulness that I am enabled to do so with the most childlike confidence.' Again, Mr. Malleson desires to retain intact 'the vast and stately edifice of Christianity.' He has no fear of a full-hearted faith, no dread of orthodoxy. But his orthodoxy is of a Protestant kind. He takes a strong Protestant line on Sacramental questions,[2] and so in his conception of Christ's Person he is an admirable example of the shifty, unstable, incoherent character which is apt to belong to un-Catholic theology even on this central subject. He has no true conception of Christ as the Restorer of man *through His humanity*. His conception of the Second Adam is the vaguest possible. 'He introduces a *Divine element* into all who will receive it' (p. 164). In this inadequate conception of the relation of Christ's humanity to ours inheres a misconception of the efficacy of Christ's example. It must be made an example effective to us on the natural level without any transmission of Christ's humanity into ours. So Christ's peccability is dogmatically asserted, as if it were part of the 'vast and stately edifice' of Christian doctrine which Mr. Malleson professes his intention to uphold.

'Jesus[3] was really subjected to the struggles of just such temptations as every man must meet and encounter if he be a man indeed. He was not made insensible to the power of temptation; it was not impossible for Jesus to sin. Jesus was liable to error and to sin, like any other human being.'

Mr. Malleson is here only saying what Dr. Farrar has said in more rhetorical language.

'Some, in a zeal at once intemperate and ignorant, have claimed for Him not only an actual sinlessness, but a nature in which sin was Divinely and miraculously impossible. What then? If this great conflict were a mere deceptive phantasmagoria, how can the narrative of it profit us? If we have to fight the battle clad in that armour of human freewill which has been hacked and riven about the bosoms of our fathers by so many a cruel blow, what comfort is it to us if our great Captain fought not only victoriously but without real danger, not only uninjured but without even the possibility of a wound? . . . Are we not thus under the semblance of devotion robbed of one who, though He were a Son, yet *learned obedience* by the things which He

[1] Preface, p. iii. [2] Pp. 164, 165, 297, &c. [3] P. 57.

suffered? Are we not thus, under the guise of orthodoxy, mocked in our belief that we have a High Priest who can be touched with a feeling of our infirmities, "being tempted *in all points like as we are*, yet without sin"? They who would *thus* honour Him rob us of our living Christ, who was very Man no less than very God, and substitute for Him a perilous Apollinarian phantom enshrined "in the cold empyrean of theology" and alike incapable of kindling devotion or inspiring love.'[1]

Dr. Farrar is here following and quoting M. de Pressensé.[2] Speaking of His 'utter humiliation,' this eminent writer says:—

'If impeccability be claimed for Him, He is withdrawn from the true conditions of earthly life. His humanity remains only an illusion, a transparent veil through which appears His impassible Divinity. Being no more like unto us, He is no more ours. To a moving drama of a moral conflict succeeds I know not what metaphysical phantasmagoria. He can no longer be spoken of as the subject of temptation or trial. Instead of the Head of a new human race we have only a mortal creature worthy of the inventions of Gnostics. Let us bring down the Christ from the cold empyrean of theology where He is but a dogma, and .... receive the strange .... text of the New Testament, "He learned obedience."'

We have argued already on the conception of Christ which these passages involve. We have argued (1) that in reality it is no question of the 'humiliation' of Christ. If He were the Eternal Word no humiliation which left Him what He was in the essential depths of personal being could make Him, the Son of God, capable of sin. No conception of His Person which enables His manhood to sin can fail to contradict the unity of His Person. 'The Word made flesh' could not sin.

We have pointed out (2) the confusions of thought in which these writers allow themselves. They confuse the capacity for being tempted or put to the proof with the capacity of failing: the capacity for appreciating a wrong suggestion with the capacity for approving and accepting it. They omit to consider that the highest freedom of the will even in us is the freedom which has lost the capacity for preferring evil. Finally, they identify in strange and careless fashion the denial of our Lord's peccability with the denial of his human nature. Is Christ not Man in heaven now? Are the saints in heaven not men? It involves the most arbitrary assumption to identify human nature with human nature in lower phases of probation. It is a denial of the whole principle of the Incarnation, the veriest Eutychianism, to assert that our man-

[1] *Life of Christ* (popular edition), p. 57.
[2] *Jesus Christ: His Times, Life, and Work.* Seventh edition, p. 232.

hood ceased to be human in becoming conditioned by completest oneness with God. The Incarnation of the Son of God, we need always to remember, is to be viewed not only as a recovery but as a *consummation* of manhood's destiny, and the human nature of Christ is no less human than Adam's because it is so much more Divine.

(3) We have emphasized, and must briefly emphasize again, that the craving to 'bring Christ down' to fellowship with us on our natural fallen level will lead these theologians, if they are logical, to lengths which they would not wish to go. A sinless Christ is not more on their level than an impeccable Christ. If He is to be 'liable to sin' in the same sense as we are in the present state, so as to be an example to us on the natural level, He must have the forces of sin *within Him* as well as without—'the traitor within the camp.' Otherwise He is utterly alien and separate from what gives temptation its special force to us. In our case the suggestion from without meets the wandering desire, the disordered affection, within, and 'we are led away of our own lusts.' If Christ is to be 'like us,' as we are, Christ must have had a disordered nature. The Pelagian Julian, who denied our nature to be in itself fallen, had to admit such concupiscence in Christ. He pleaded for it as Dr. Farrar and M. de Pressensé and Mr. Malleson do for the peccability, in the interests of Christ's example.[1]

'If He was made of a woman to give us an example, and did not at the same time clothe Himself in all the properties of our nature, if He had the flesh without the soul, or the manhood without the sensations with which nature endows us, He is not shown to have fulfilled the conditions of example. What was there praiseworthy in His despising the seductions of the senses if the benefit of nature made Him incapable of their attractions? What wonder that He should restrain eyes, which had the flesh on their side, from wrongful wanderings? What marvel that He should have been so sparing day by day in food if He could not feel its attractions? How much veneration could His discipline of the ears command if they were open to none but honourable voices and by a natural endowment deaf to what is forbidden? Where is the glory of His chastity if it was not born of an exercise of His will?'

The ambiguities in this questioning S. Augustine points out. Christ had all our faculties. All He did He did by an exercise of His human will. 'But,' he adds,

'if you make the excellence of abstaining from sin to consist in the conquest of lusts, so that there would be no excellence where there were no lusts, then it will follow that a man is more eminent in his

[1] S. Augustini *Op. Imperfect. c. Julianum*, iv. 49–50.

virtue in proportion to the magnitude of the vicious propensities which he has to overcome. Ac per hoc Christus, secundum istam vestram horribilem ac detestabilem pravitatem, sicut in virtute omnium hominum maximus, ita esse in carne libidinosissimus debuit.'

This is simply logic—logic to which Edward Irving yielded, so as to make Christ take a fallen 'flesh of sin.'[1] But it is logic to which Scripture will not permit us to yield. The Christ whom Scriptural doctrine and Scriptural history present to us is a Christ 'undefiled,'[2] 'tempted in all points like us, *apart from sin.*'[3] That is the Scriptural Christ, available for an example not because He is like us on the natural level, but because 'separated from sinners and made higher than the heavens' He becomes by virtue of His humanity the Source of recreative life to the race of His redeemed. May we say, then, that Mr. Malleson, with his greater predecessors, 'falls between two stools'? They have neither a Christ who is their example by winning His way upward into purity out of a fallen nature, corrupt like ours, nor a Christ who, being in His human nature none the less at every moment all-holy God, does through His Body, ever sinless, purge and renew our sinfulness. If Mr. Malleson would, we contend, study theology on its ancient lines, he would indeed find that the theology which begins by seeming to put Christ further off us in reality ends by making Him inconceivably near us—nothing less than the Life of our life.

The last part of our present task is the criticism of two anonymous books which seem to demand more careful notice than either of those we have yet dealt with. *The Gospel of the Nineteenth Century* represents, with its companion volume of *Familiar Discourses* on *Christ our Ideal*, a considerable theological and spiritual effort. We have an elaborate exhibition of the moral principles involved in Christ's example; we have an elaborate theory of the mode in which Christ's example is made available for us, involving a theology of Christ's Person, and even a scheme of Trinitarian doctrine. These books, then, represent a greater effort than any we have yet had to deal with, and, judging from the number of editions that *The Gospel of the Nineteenth Century* has gone through, a greater measure of success.

[1] Mill's *Sermons on the Temptation*, note 1. We suppose Dr. Farrar would not substantially quarrel with S. Augustine for saying (*Op. Imperfect. c. Julian.* iv. 47), 'Si quis credit carnem Christi contra spiritum concupisse, anathema sit.'

[2] See Delitzsch *in loc.* Hebr. vii. 26.

[3] Here again see Delitzsch's note, Hebr. iv. 15.

The author has been drawn, we have said, into a theology of Christ's Person. He has been forced into it, almost, perhaps, against his will; for his aim was not theological—we may say it was antitheological. He wants to get men to join in Christian fellowship on the simple basis of an acceptance of Christ as the perfect human example. He wants a society, as a basis of union among Christians, which shall have no other doctrine as its condition of membership. Thus his primary purpose is an admirable one: to expound what human life means as Christ represents it to us, or what is meant by accepting Christ's example. There is considerable suggestiveness as well as obvious and genuine earnestness in our author's delineation of Christ's character. There is nowhere, indeed, perceptible that touch of a master's hand, of which readers of *Ecce Homo* became from time to time conscious in those pages which seemed as constantly suggestive as unsatisfying; there is nothing here on this highest level, as it seems to us; the frequency of quotation in these pages would suggest an appreciative and zealous student rather than a first-hand thinker. But there is vigour, appreciation, and earnestness everywhere, and a tone of fresh enthusiasm in the discourses. The mode in which Christ is presented, moreover, seems to us to start from the right end. The exclusively moral aim of Christ's work is grasped with strong conviction; with more strong conviction than accuracy, indeed, for surely it is not true to say that 'Christianity *consists in the imitation of Christ*.'[1] Christianity surely finds its special characteristic in supplying not the ideal, but the means of realizing it: Christianity *consists in* the moral end presented in the character of Christ *coupled with* the means which God devised to make its realization possible for man through Christ. But, not to be over critical, this book starts, we are grateful to believe, from the right point of view in presenting us with an exclusively moral *aim* of Christ's work—the production or restoration of moral character in man. This is the meaning of salvation.[2] It will follow that the author from this true point of view is able at once to discard all false 'imputationism.' Christ's righteousness must not be reckoned as ours 'by any unreal and fictitious transfer of merit,'[3] but must become ours here and now, really and actually—'to a certain extent' at least 'actually and to the fullest extent potentially.' Wherever, indeed, Christ's own words are honestly listened to, wherever Christ's own concep-

[1] *The Gospel of the Nineteenth Century*, p. 279.
[2] P. 223. [3] P. 252.

tion of Judgment, as the great Reality, the great annihilator of veils and shams, is honestly faced, the figment of external imputationism vanishes like a bad dream.

'It is not by any arbitrary and unreal imputation of a merit which he does not possess that "the Christian" is accounted righteous before God, but by virtue of a most real participation in the Spirit of Christ. It is true that this participation is not in fulness, but only in degree. His faith as yet may be only as a grain of mustard seed; yet it contains within itself all the undeveloped powers of the Christian life, even as the seed contains the future tree.'[1]

The moral aim of Christ's mission thus fundamentally grasped, it follows that the mistake of making the sacrifice of Christ's death the *central point* of His work, instead of a necessary condition of it, is carefully avoided. The sacrifice secured our pardon; it made forgiveness of sins possible. But forgiveness of sins is a negative process, a necessary preliminary to the positive work of moral recreation, though always subordinate to it. 'Prominent as is the place assigned in the teaching of Christ and His Apostles to the forgiveness of sins, it is always subordinate to the recreation of the soul in the image of Christ; it is the means to this end.'[2]

This is, then, Christ's main function—to recreate our lives in his image. And the Christ who is to do this is a supernatural Person, as would appear, in our author's conception. He speaks strongly of the folly of those who try to get rid of 'the supernatural element' out of Christ's life.[3] He has a true conception of His flesh, His humanity, as filled with supernatural efficacy. He interprets His miracles truly as (so to speak) the *natural* outcome of its *supernatural* power.[4] Again, he sees clearly the limitations on the power of mere human example,[5] which we discussed above, and the consequent necessity of Christ standing to us in some relation other than that of mere example, even coupled with the negative condition of forgiveness through His sacrifice. Example of such transcendent perfection has, as he very strikingly remarks, an actual power 'to repel.'[6] 'The force of the contrast' between the perfect Pattern and our own inadequacy, 'when fully realized, is crushing.' It produces simply the sense of sin and makes us cry with S. Peter, 'Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord!' Thus to example must be added sacrifice, if Christ's work is to be complete.[7] 'Without the sacrifice the example is useless,' and to sacrifice must be

[1] *The Gospel*, &c., p. 252. [2] P. 230. [3] P. 105.
[4] Pp. 166–169. [5] P. 205. [6] Pp. 210, 211. [7] P. 256.

added recreation into the image of that which is yet too high for us. Christ is truly conceived of as the Second Adam, the Head of a new race, a new creation—such as may be conceived of as a new stage of evolution (understood as a genuine Theist can understand it) in the whole system, 'a new creation on the analogy of the old.'[1]

So far all is good. The scheme of Christ's relation to us is admirably grasped. It would involve naturally the true conception of the Incarnation and of grace. But it is here, at the centre, in his conception of the Person of Christ, that the author fails somewhat strangely. We cannot conceive what he hopes to gain by trying to form a new conception for himself of Christ's Person, as if the problem had never been thought out, as if it were every man's duty in each age to discard all previous thought and start afresh. The author disclaims, indeed, any idea of 'putting forth a new Gospel,'[2] and yet his conception of Christ's is one which is either new or has been tried and found wanting. It seems to us neither so coherent, so intelligible, nor so Scriptural as the Catholic doctrine, and certainly it involves no smaller claim on faith, only the faith is claimed for a private individual's more or less ingenious theory, instead of for the stable and continuous teaching of a Universal Church. Christ, then (to state briefly the author's theology), seems to be viewed on earth as so purely human as to exclude His being personally God. 'His union with the Father did not place Him while on earth in a position different in kind from that of the prophets and saints of old.' 'This,' he says, 'is clear,' and also 'that though He never failed under trial as they did, yet He was in all respects tried as they were tried,'[3] 'and there was but one thing to distinguish His life from theirs, its perfect goodness.' His will was free, in the same sense as ours.[4] He has then, this must mean, a clear and distinct human personality. In what sense, then, is He God? Only in this, that as perfect Man He is the perfect Organ and Instrument of the Divine Moral Power. Man is specially designed, among the creatures of God's hand, to manifest His moral power. 'In whatever degree' he does this[5] 'in that degree he fulfils the object of his creation. It follows from this that the perfect Man is the perfect Organ of this power. In Him it is manifested wholly and completely.' In this sense, then, He is God: He is the Son of God. And in agreement with this we have a concep-

[1] *Christ our Ideal*, cap. v. vi.
[2] *The Gospel*, &c., Preface.
[3] P. ix., and *Christ our Ideal*, p. 35.
[4] *The Gospel*, &c., p. 309.
[5] P. 308.

tion of the Son of God, the Second Person of the Trinity, as 'the manifestation of the essential perfection of the Father, viz. goodness.' This, 'goodness and wisdom,' as it is afterwards explained, 'and not infinite power and knowledge,' are regarded as 'the attributes of the Divine Nature proper to the Second Person of the Godhead.' The author seems alive to the uncatholic character of his theology, and puts forward the position only tentatively;[1] but it would seem that the only conception of the Incarnation which his doctrine of Christ's human nature would really admit of is one such as would make Christ the manifestation of Divine goodness in a human nature. Then He is God *because He is* perfectly Man.

How, then, is His example made available to us? By faith. We accept Christ's example; we take His yoke upon us.[2] In the act of taking Christ's yoke upon and committing ourselves to follow His steps, we enter into the favour of God, the sacrifice of Christ's perfect life, and death becomes available for our pardon;[3] and more than this, we become conformed to Christ gradually through studying His character. The study of any man's character tends to impress that character on us. Christ's character we so admire that *admiration* passes into *adoration*:[4] by faith we adore Christ, and by faith adoring Him we become like Him;[5] we are brought near to Him, so near Him that His Spirit, which is the Soul of His example,[6] passes into us. His Spirit may be really said to dwell in us (just, we suppose, as on a lower level the spirit of Socrates, *i.e.* the soul of Socrates' example, may be said to have passed into his disciples). Thus we, too, become in our turn Christ-like by the power of faith. Christ's life, Christ's mind becomes ours. The more of the Spirit of Christ we have—*i.e.* the more spiritual life we have—the more we belong to Christ.[7] We really may be said to feed on Christ, to eat His flesh and drink His blood, to be one with Him and He with us.[8]

There is a higher stream of language about Christ's relation to us in this book; but, perhaps unjustly, perhaps with something of the uncharity of the critical reason, we are led to explain the higher language in the light of the lower; otherwise there is much that would lead us to say that Christ really imparts to us His Holy Spirit to make Himself present

[1] *The Gospel*, &c., pp. 364, 365. [2] P. 254. [3] P. 230.
[4] P. 321. [5] P. 238. [6] P. 223.
[7] *Christ our Ideal*, pp. 122, 123; *The Gospel*, &c., p. 253.
[8] Pp. 239, 240.

within us, and that it is this Holy Spirit which by His indwelling produces His character in us, not our efforts to be like-minded to Christ which give us His Spirit.[1] So there is orthodox language about the Incarnation which frequently recurs. Yet we are sure, at any rate, that we are not wronging the author in saying that he does not conceive of Christ as the Mediator of a new life through the actual participation by us of His humanity. Christ is in us because His virtues are, instead of His virtues being in us because He is.

But we will say no more than this. Our author wished to write a book on Christ's example. He had the choice of enjoying the full heritage of the Church's thought on this subject —the full experience of misconceptions on the one side and on the other, which by the assistance of the Holy Spirit of Christ the Church had been able to detect and warn us off from. Our author might have thus enjoyed the full inheritance of the saints in light. He has chosen another course, and we ask what he has gained by it. He has not made Christ's life less supernatural. His theory postulates a supernatural revelation of a Trinity; he has to make a supernatural claim on man's faith. Then why not do so with the Church? Why be isolated? Why start afresh? Why devise a Trinitarian doctrine all of his own, confining the *proper* attribute of the Son to moral goodness, a limitation most un-Pauline?[2] The result, we contend, is only to lose that marvellous natural coherence and completeness which the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation with its extension through the sacraments possesses. So many elements of Scriptural doctrine are absent from our author's conceptions. He has no real doctrine of a fall, just as he has no certain doctrine of Christ as the Source of recreating grace. He must explain away all the sturdy sacramentalism of Scripture with its steady implication that since the 'Word was made flesh' the mediation of the spiritual through the material has been the law of God's action upon man. Even when he is speaking of Christ's life on earth we do not feel at all that he is giving a fair representation. The element of authority, we have urged above, was much more prominent than the element of example at first. Christ did not seem to come to teach men to be like Him, but to call men to obey Him, which is a different thing; and we doubt whether there is any passage of Scripture which would justify our author[3] in saying that 'if we had asked Christ what He meant by taking His yoke upon

[1] *The Gospel*, &c., pp. 223, 329. [2] Col. i. 16, 17.
[3] *Christ our Ideal*, p. 37.

us and learning of Him . . . . He would have told us to try to be humble as He was, to trust in God as He trusted, to seek to do God's will as He sought to do it.' We mean that this instruction or explanation would not have come at first, and 'the taking Him for our Master' would have implied first of all a more authoritative position on His part toward us. As it is, our author's zeal to reduce Christ's consciousness to our level, leads him to explain away S. John's assertion of His prescience of Judas' treachery;[1] and his conception of the relation of Christ to us appears to forget Pentecost and the institution of the Eucharist, or at least to give them a very inadequate explanation. We are indeed really grateful for all our author has given. We do not want to end with criticism. Still we contend that he would have lost nothing and gained much if he would have put himself at starting more thoroughly on the lines of Catholic theology.

ART. IV.—PIERRE FRANÇOIS LE COURAYER.

A Dissertation on the Validity of the Ordinations of the English and of the Succession of the Bishops of the Anglican Church, &c. By the Rev. FATHER PIERRE FRANÇOIS LE COURAYER, &c. &c. (Oxford, 1844.)

THERE is scarcely a more interesting episode in the history of the Church of England than that which is exhibited in the correspondence between Archbishop Wake and the Doctors of the Sorbonne Du Pin and Girardin. In the interchange of civilities, and the conciliatory tone adopted in this correspondence, there seemed to be some not slight indications of the possibility of such a union between the Anglican and Gallican Churches as, leaving them both free to hold their distinct Confessions, might unite them on a common ground as against Romish tyranny. That the correspondence issued in nothing was due not so much to theological antipathies as to political and State interference, and especially to the evil conduct of the Abbé du Bois, who sought by sacrificing Gallicanism to earn his cardinal's hat from Rome. But, though abortive in its issue, the correspondence must ever

[1] *The Gospel*, &c., p. 132.

remain in the highest degree interesting. It is impossible to read Du Pin's *Commonitorium* on our Thirty-nine Articles without instruction and advantage. Here we have the views of a most learned and very tolerant theologian on the confession of the English Church, and may see Anglican doctrines treated in quite another fashion, and with quite a different amount of knowledge, from the way in which they were handled by Bossuet, whose knowledge of the English Church was altogether deficient. Du Pin's views will be instructive to us both as to what they accept and what they reject. It will hardly fail to strike a reader of the *Commonitorium* as something remarkable that, though but little objection is raised by the learned Sorbonist to the Anglican doctrine of the Sacraments, he should have animadverted as he has on the Thirty-sixth Article, which declares that the ordinal of the Anglican Church contains all things necessary for the consecration of bishops and the ordering of priests and deacons, and that all those who are or have been consecrated or ordered according to it are 'rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordained.' This statement Dr. du Pin found great difficulty in accepting. He states, in his *Commonitorium*, that he would not have the English ordinations *pronounced* absolutely null, though some of them, perhaps, are so; and he thinks that if a union between the Churches takes place, the English clergy ought to be continued in their offices and benefices, either by right or indulgence ('sive ex jure, sive ex indulgentiâ ecclesiæ'). It is easy to see, from these qualified expressions, that there was in the Doctor's mind a considerable doubt as to the validity of Anglican orders. Archbishop Wake was surprised at this; and writing to Mr. Beauvoir, the English chaplain at Paris, he says:—

'I have, in answer to two of Dr. du Pin's MSS., described the method of making bishops in our Church; I believe he will be equally both pleased and surprised with it. I wish you could show him the form of consecration as it stands in the end of your large Common Prayer Book.'[1]

He also offers, in case the information sent is not sufficient, to give the Sorbonne Doctors any further information they may require as to Anglican orders. What the effect of these communications was upon Du Pin does not appear. He died shortly afterwards. But they were not without their effect upon the history of the Church of England. At that time there was associated with the Sorbonne Doctors, in their spirited

[1] Maclaine's *Appendix to Mosheim.*

opposition to the Bull *Unigenitus*, a young divine of conspicuous talent and energy, a man not afraid to inquire and think for himself, and not disposed to sacrifice his reasoning powers and his historical knowledge to the requirements of Papal decrees. This was Pierre François le Courayer, a canon of the Augustinian Abbey of S. Geneviève, near Paris—a man already known in the world of letters, and who had, on account of his learning, been made custodian of the splendid library belonging to the abbey. Courayer was born at Rouen, November 17, 1681. His father was president of the court of justice at that city. Having been educated at Vernon and Beauvais, he joined the fraternity of S. Geneviève; in 1706 he was made presbyter of the congregation, and in 1711 librarian. He had published several small works on literary subjects, when, in 1714, he became one of the appellants against the Bull *Unigenitus*, which condemned the Jansenists, though he himself was in no way inclined to adopt Jansenist views. These appellants obtained the name of Anti-Constitutionaries, or the opposers of the Papal Constitution. The famous Cardinal de Noailles at one time belonged to them, as did all the most prominent Doctors of the Sorbonne. The strife between them and the Constitutionist party was keen and bitter. It was, in fact, a strife as to whether Gallicanism should still exist, or all liberty be swallowed up in the gulf of Roman intolerance. Hence the hand held out by the French Doctors towards the English Church, the happy freedom of which they envied, and hence the spirited exhortations of Archbishop Wake to the clergy of France to free themselves from this tyranny, not by waiting for the shadowy aid of a General Council, but by the act of a national synod, which should assert and secure for ever the privileges of the Gallican Church,[1] just in the same way as had been done by the Anglican Church. In these discussions and negotiations M. Courayer no doubt took the most lively interest. The claim of the Anglican Church for catholicity, and of validity for its orders, was probably new to him, as it was to Du Pin. It was always convenient for the Roman controversialists to group

[1] 'State ergo in libertate quâ Christus vos donaverit. Frustra ad concilium generale nunquam convocandum res vestras refertis, frustra decretorum vim suspendere curatis, quæ ab initio injusta, erronea ac absurda ac plane nulla erant. Non talibus subsidiis vobis opus est. Regiâ permissione, auctoritate suâ a Christo commissâ, archiepiscopi et episcopi vestri in concilium nationale coeant: academiarum, cleri, et præcipue utrarumque principis theologicæ facultatis Parisiensis consilium atque auxilium sibi assumant. Sic muniti quod æquum et justum fuerit decernant.'

the Catholic Church of England with the Protestant sects, and in general a crass ignorance as to its real position prevailed on the Continent. It was but of little avail that perfectly conclusive treatises as to the validity of the English orders had been written by Mason, Browne, Bramhall, and others. 'Most of the English books,' says Courayer, 'are but little known in France; and moreover, as we have but little concerned ourselves to clear up this difficulty, I do not find that we have changed our prejudices, or that we think upon the subject otherwise than we did before.' Struck, in the course of the discussion between Wake and Du Pin, with the ignorance prevailing on this subject, Courayer had set himself to study it, but he had not intended to write anything on it until he was determined to this by a new cause arising. The Abbé Renaudot, famous for his Oriental learning, had thought fit to compose a memoir on the 'Validity of the English Ordinations.' This memoir was printed in a book of the Abbé Gould's, entitled *The True Faith of the Catholic Church*, and published at Paris in the year 1720. It contains an extraordinary amount of misstatements, some of them so glaringly absurd that they could not have been set forth had the least attempt at fair inquiry been made. But we may well pardon the Abbé Renaudot's absurdities, since the publication of them was the immediate cause of bringing forth from Courayer his famous and conclusive treatise on English orders.

'All the benefit which I received by reading his book,' he writes, 'was that it revived in me a desire to re-examine a question which I had formerly studied; and this desire produced a memoir, which I communicated to some of my friends, who were so kind as to do me the favour to examine it, and who had the goodness to approve of it. My design had been at first to proceed no further than that memoir; but my friends thought otherwise, because they did not find it so full as the importance of the subject deserved. I was forced, therefore, to new-mould what I had written, that I might give a just compass both to the proofs and the difficulties; and this was the origin of the treatise which I now commit to the judgment of the public. If the works of the English in favour of their ministry were better known, I should not have troubled the public with a book of which it could have had but little need; but I hope I shall be indulged in some degree in favour of a question so important and so little examined among us as that I propose to treat of. The thing in question is no less than to know whether the Church of England, formerly so illustrious, and even now so respectable, for the enlightenment of her prelates and the condition of her clergy, is without a succession, without a hierarchy, and without a ministry. Many of our divines maintain this, and the English deny it.'

The work of Courayer is all the more valuable inasmuch as it was not written from the point of view of accepting the position of the English Church. He held that Church to be in a state of schism, but nevertheless to have the quality of catholicity in her:—

'Of all the Churches which have broken the unity, the Church of England has kept the nearest to us. She has ever retained the greater part of our customs and ceremonies; and if some divines laboured with the same industry to reunite men's minds, and to banish all the seeds of division as they seem bent on perpetuating it, and heightening disputes, we might perhaps in our own days see the schism end, and peace and the blessings of truth and charity return.'

In holding that the Church of England had been guilty of schism, in rejecting the usurpations of the Pope and regulating her own formularies, Courayer went much further than Du Pin. This latter Doctor, in his *Commonitorium*, declares his opinion that 'every Church ought to enjoy its own liberties and privileges, which the Pope has no right to infringe.' He holds that 'a union between the English and French bishops and clergy may be completed, or at least advanced, without consulting the Roman Pontiff, who may be informed of the union as soon as it is accomplished, and may be invited to assent to it.'[1] Courayer, on the contrary, holds that even 'in proving the succession the English recover not all the advantages they have lost *in separating themselves from the Church.*'[2] This false view, however, as to the apparent schismatical position of the Church of England makes Courayer's treatise all the more valuable. It is not as a partisan of Anglicanism that he writes, but as a candid and unbiassed inquirer. 'The truth ought to be dearer to us than the nearest ties, and we have no other interest in all our inquiries than to seek and embrace it.' Having thus determined to expand his memoir into a complete treatise, Courayer's first proceeding was to apply for information to Archbishop Wake. He had found this prelate ready to give the fullest explanations in his communications to Du Pin and Girardin, and he doubted not the same courtesy would be extended to himself. Nor was he mistaken. The Archbishop at once fully replied to him, and the correspondence thus begun was continued through life.

The author of the article on Wake in the old *Biographia Britannica* had before him no less than forty-five letters written by the Archbishop to the French divine. With this

[1] *Appendix to Mosheim.*
[2] Preface to *English Ordinations.*

efficient help Courayer finished and perfected his *Dissertation on the Validity of the Ordinations of the English.* The work was approved by the censor, but the author made no movement towards getting it published. There was a strong influence at work to keep it back. The Jesuit and Ultramontane party dreaded beyond measure its candid statements and fair historical inquiry. The old scandalous Nag's Head story, with which, even when not venturing absolutely to adopt it, they had fondly paltered, seemed to be on the point of utter extinction, and they would still keep it in reserve. The Constitutionalists saw that the Gallican party would gain a great addition of force by this liberation of a Church which had dared to be free from the malicious scandals industriously cast upon it.[1] Thus every engine was set at work to keep back the book. It had received the approbation of the censor, but the 'privilege' was withheld, and no French publisher could venture without this to set it forth. Under these circumstances a little artifice was resorted to. Courayer's friends *secretly* possessed themselves of the MS., and sent it to the press without the author's privity. One may pretty well conjecture the way in which the transaction was managed. By some means or other the MS. got printed in Lorraine, and published with the name of a Brussels publisher on the title-page. Thus the guardians of the old Papal fictions were eluded, and the lovers of truth were gratified. From these a number of approving letters were poured in upon the author, and laudatory notices appeared in the leading literary organs of the day. The *Nouvelles littéraires* pronounced the treatise to be by 'a master hand. He follows his adversary foot to foot, and overwhelms him by the force of his reasons, which he pushes to demonstration.' There had been no name printed on the title-page, but the authorship was an open secret. The editor of the *Journal des Savans* wrote to Courayer for permission to name him. This was readily accorded. But the favourable notice which the book received in this periodical drew down on the editor of it the severe reproof of Cardinal Fleury. The great Churchmen, as a rule, both Jansenist and Jesuit, were very angry. The Jesuit journalists of Trévoux appear to have led off the attack. The author was one of those who cannot bear misrepresentations calmly. He replied to the Jesuits in a bitter and damaging letter. His time was now likely to be fully occupied. The

[1] The causes of the delay are fully explained by Courayer in his *Historical and Apologetic Relation*, published at Amsterdam in 1729.

book appeared at the end of the year 1723, and for several years after this Courayer was occupied with writing answers and defences to the attacks made upon him, the account of which he afterwards published in a work of two volumes. The most remarkable assault was that made by the Abbé Hardouin. This was the 'exceedingly learned' man who wrote a book to prove that all the works of the classical authors (with the exception of a very few) were forgeries of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, due to heretical pravity, to turn away the minds of the people from the eternal verities. It would cost such a writer very little to assert the forgery of *Parker's Register*, though it be a volume of 411 pages, containing a mass of circumstantial entries upon a great variety of subjects,[1] or of those numerous other diocesan registers, public documents, and contemporary notices which establish Parker's consecration. With such an antagonist it was impossible to argue seriously, and Courayer was strictly within bounds when he declared that Hardouin's 'refutation' was confined to its title-page. A more formidable antagonist appeared in the Dominican Le Quien, a friend of Renaudot, whose memoir had given birth to the book. These two learned divines were both famed as Orientalists, but their studies in Western literature appear to have been somewhat deficient. Renaudot's memoir is full of gross blunders, and Le Quien, without knowing anything really of the subject, applied his great powers as a writer to throw doubts upon everything, and to involve all Courayer's arguments in a misty haze which might prevent or neutralize their effect. This writer, from the dexterity of his attacks, gave Courayer considerable trouble when he came to compose his *Defence*. A French-Irishman, named Fennel, Dean of Laon, gave less trouble in answering, but much more in reading; his bulky work being written, as Courayer complains, in 'French-Irish.' Another assailant, a Cluniac monk, who wrote very politely, took the very unnecessary trouble of proving at length that the Anglican ordinal was altered without any consent or approval on the part of Rome. Against these manifold antagonists Courayer wrote his *Defence* of his treatise. They had all of them used more or less unfair weapons. The honesty of Le Quien, the ablest of them, may be judged from the fact that he gravely argues against the English ordinal on the ground that there was no special petition relative to the deacon's office before the imposition of hands; quietly

[1] Haddan's Preface to Bramhall, vol. iii.

ignoring the special suffrage in the Litany, expressly inserted for that purpose. There are also many false quotations and mistranslations in his work. Yet this was the antagonist whom Courayer thought the most considerable—indeed, the only one whom he thought 'reasonable'—and it is, in fact, against him that the *Defence* is written. This *Defence* was ready in 1726, and was approved by the censor; but again, as before, the Jesuit clique, who had the power of giving or withholding 'privilege,' refused it. Courayer was therefore obliged to get it printed surreptitiously, and it appeared with the name of the same Brussels publisher that the first volume exhibited. It was a larger work than the first treatise, consisting of two double volumes and containing the proofs in full. The same sort of reception was accorded to it as had been given to the other. It was much praised by many and bitterly railed against by others. Replies were at once rife. Father Hardouin eclipsed his former performance in absurdity. 'It is,' says Courayer, 'from the beginning to the end the most complete romance which perhaps has yet appeared in a serious disputation. Neither manuscripts nor printed works stop him. All that is opposed to him is, according to him, either forged or antedated.' The other replies seemed to Courayer to require no further answer than he gave to them in the preface to his *Historical Relation* of the controversy, published in 1729. But in 1730 Le Quien brought out another bulky attack, and the unfortunate champion of Anglicanism was constrained to answer him in a Supplement. This last work was not composed in France, for long before its appearance Courayer's enemies had so far prevailed against him as to drive him as an exile from his country under the stigma of an ecclesiastical censure. But before we quit the subject of his works on English orders the reader will not object to have placed before him an estimate of the value of Courayer's labours on this ground by a most competent judge, who has examined everything bearing on this controversy with scrupulous exactness—the late very learned A. W. Haddan. In his Preface to Bramhall's *Consecration of Protestant Bishops Vindicated* Mr. Haddan says:—

'I have had occasion to go over the same ground as Courayer, so far as the question of fact is concerned, and to consult a large portion (though not the whole) of the original documents from which he has quoted, and I am able to vouch for the extent and general accuracy of his information, and for the honesty with which he has employed it.'

Passing with this satisfactory testimony from Courayer's treatment of the subject of English orders, we recur to the actual and immediate cause of his disgrace with the authorities of his Church. In his treatise on *Orders* it was necessary for him to handle the subject of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, inasmuch as much of the Romish attack on the sufficiency of the English ordinal was connected with this point. This accordingly Courayer had done in the third volume of his *Defence.* In this he maintains the sufficiency of the ordinal of Edward; and while he contends that 'the validity of the ordinations of the English is altogether independent of what they may think of the Sacrifice,' he denies that they have, as a Church, rejected that doctrine. He maintains that the doctrine of the Sacrifice is drawn by the Fathers and divines not from the Real Presence (though true), but from the representation and memory of our Saviour's death; but that supposing that Presence necessary to the idea of a sacrifice, 'that which the English admit would suffice for a spiritual sacrifice, such as is that of the Church.'[1]

In adopting this primitive and Catholic view of the Eucharistic Sacrifice Courayer had ventured on most perilous ground. The whole history of doctrine, from Paschasius Radbert downwards, proves to demonstration that nothing is so dangerous to a divine as to enunciate views on the Eucharist differing from the theology in vogue. The history of this subject is replete with persecution, suffering, and tales of blood. It was not long before Courayer was made to feel the effects of his bold statements. A pamphlet entitled *Important Observations,* &c., was at once prepared by the Coadjutor Bishop of Orleans and presented to the assembly of the clergy, denouncing as heretical the statements in Courayer's treatise on the Sacrifice. Courayer had in vain endeavoured to prevent the publication of this attack by offering to give such explanations of his views as would satisfy the author. The *Observations* appeared, and Courayer answered them in a *mémoire,* in which he describes the *Observations* as an 'anonymous libel.' This *mémoire* is printed in the second or documentary part of his *Defence.* Being warned that mischief was brewing against him, Courayer endeavoured to forestall it by writing letters to the Cardinal de Noailles, Archbishop of Paris, and to M. Girardin, Doctor of the Sorbonne, fully explaining his views on the Eucharistic Sacrifice (March 1727). All, however, was of no avail. Courayer had a band of active and deter-

[1] Introduction to *English Ordinations,* p. xxxiv, note.

mined enemies ranged against him. Exasperated by his bold and unanswerable defence of English orders, these men welcomed gladly an opportunity of humbling this stubborn controversialist. At an assembly of twenty bishops, with the Cardinal de Bissy at their head, held at the Abbey of S. Germain, near Paris, Courayer's works were formally condemned, and soon after were suppressed by authority. The author was threatened with excommunication if he did not retract his statements, and was ordered into a sort of captivity at the Priory of Hennemont, at St. Germain-en-Laye. Meantime various episcopal rescripts were set out against him, and in particular one by the Cardinal de Noailles, which was so full of misrepresentation that Courayer was most anxious to answer it, but could not do so with safety without quitting the country. The idea of escape being thus present to his mind, his thoughts naturally turned towards England, the religious history of which country had occupied him for so many years, and with whose Primate he had exchanged so many friendly epistles. Archbishop Wake did his best to encourage him to this step; but it is probable that Courayer would never have attempted it had there not then been residing at Paris an English bishop whose firm and bold character and ready assistance and advice proved invaluable to the timid French priest—the man of books and controversies, who knew nothing of the world beyond the environs of Paris, and who was altogether ignorant of the English tongue. Atterbury had long been on intimate terms with Courayer, attracted to him no doubt by his gallant defence of the English Church and by similarity of sentiment. The picture of the French divine hung on his walls as one of the principal ornaments of his room.[1] He had shared in Courayer's satisfaction when the university with which he had long been so closely connected had voted the French divine the degree of D.D. *honoris causâ*. He had visited him in his retreat at Hennemont, and had encouraged Courayer's plan of escape to England. He had done more than this. He had provided him with an intelligent attendant for his journey, well versed in French and English, and able to smooth over any difficulties which might occur on the road. We have Courayer's testimony as to the valuable assistance thus rendered him. On the night before his departure the French priest visited the Bishop, and after expressing his gratitude for his help, and

[1] This picture, left by Atterbury's will to the University of Oxford, still perpetuates the memory of the French divine there.

receiving his last directions for the way, took his leave.[1] It was about the middle of January (1728) when Courayer escaped from Paris, and he appears to have reached Calais without accident, and without his retreat becoming known.[2] Here, however, a somewhat rash act on his part was near bringing him into trouble. He wrote to the superior of his order and to the Duc de Noailles to explain and justify the step he had taken. He had not calculated on the possible perversity of the winds. He was detained several days at Calais, during which time despatches were hastening to the coast to stop him on his way. Happily those were not the days of electric telegraphs, and the father escaped, but very narrowly, and reached Greenwich in safety. Here a triumphant welcome awaited him. Lord Percival sent his coach and six to convey him to his house, which he desired the Doctor to regard as his own, and after dinner made him a handsome present. Archbishop Wake received him the next day at Lambeth with the utmost cordiality, and made him a like present. Bishops Hare, Sherlock, and others bestowed liberal presents on him; the Marquis of Blandford sent him a donation of fifty pounds. Courayer suddenly found himself transferred from the condition of a persecuted scholar, contending single-handed against Church and State and all the wiles of the Jesuits, to be quite the lion of the day, overwhelmed with civilities and handsome presents, the favoured guest of the nobility, the honoured companion of the leading prelates. One is forcibly reminded of the reception of Antonio de Dominis, Archbishop of Spalatro, in the time of James I., or that of Erasmus by Archbishop Warham and Henry VIII. It is satisfactory to think that Courayer did not, like the first of these, repay the kindness heaped upon him by treachery. It is equally satisfactory to record that the kindness lavished upon him at first did not degenerate into coldness, but that for the long period of nearly half a century during which he resided in England, he never ceased to be well and liberally treated, and to enjoy an abundant sufficiency of means. He never, like De Dominis, pretended to be converted to the Anglican Church or received preferment therein. He lived and died a French priest of the Roman obedience, though his doctrinal views, as will be seen, underwent some very singular transformations; but from first to

[1] Atterbury's *Correspondence*, i. p. 102.

[2] It appears that he had obtained leave to change his retreat at Hennemont for one at Senlis, which would account for his departure not having excited suspicion.

last he was always on good terms with the leading personages in Church and State in England. This, no doubt, was greatly due to the sweetness of temper, the happy, contented, and charitable disposition which he possessed. He was not, like Erasmus, ever grumbling that his *douceurs* were so small, and ever pining after some luxury which he could not afford. His wants were of the simplest description, his life such as became a monk; and from the means which were furnished to him he was able not only to supply all his own needs, but to give very largely in charity. Meanwhile Bishop Atterbury at Paris had to suffer some inconvenience for the part he had taken in aiding the flight of the inculpated divine. The Bishop writes to a correspondent:—

'I wrote to you by the post this day an account of a message sent me from the King and the Cardinal by the Lieutenant de Police in relation to Père Courayer. It has made a great noise here, but the truth is as I have told you. I did not mince the matter to the magistrate, nor am at all ashamed of what has happened, nor concerned for it. I owned my friendship for Père Courayer, told them frankly a great deal more than they knew of that matter as far as I was concerned, and thought there was no reason to wonder at or blame my conduct. I convinced them of that point, and I believe there is an end of it.[1] I showed the Lieutenant the picture of Père Courayer hanging up in my room, told him I had visited him in his retreat at Hanment while he was in disgrace, and that he came to take his leave of me the night before he left Paris; and that in all this I thought I had done nothing that misbecame me. If you see Père Courayer let him know these circumstances.'[2]

With Courayer in England all went smoothly and prosperously. The author of a Life of him says:—

'He got early in the habit of living for months together in one or other of the first families of this kingdom; and at the different habitations of the Countess of Hertford, afterwards Duchess of Somerset, it was not unusual for him to make visits of six months at a time.'

Though he had been aided by Atterbury, and still retained his friendship towards him, Courayer did not, on his arrival in England, form any connexion with the Jacobite and High

[1] There was not altogether 'an end of it' nevertheless. The Bishop received a message from the Cardinal 'que le Roi désiroit que les Jansénistes ne trouvassent auprès de vous ni ressources ni conseils, et que vous éloignasses surtout de votre hostel quelques prêtres dont la doctrine est contraire à celle de l'Eglise Romaine, et qui Sa Majesté veut qu'elle soit uniformément observée dans tous ses états.' In fact Cardinal Fleury was so angry with the Bishop that he made Paris an uncomfortable quarter for him, and soon afterwards, partly on this ground, he quitted it.

[2] Atterbury's *Correspondence*, iv. 102.

Church section of the Anglican divines. The influence of Archbishop Wake no doubt prevented this, and his own interests and desire to obtain help and patronage in high places confirmed him in it. The Archbishop and some of his influential friends had at once employed themselves in soliciting for him a pension from the English Government. This was a somewhat difficult matter to compass, as Cardinal Fleury, with whom the English Government desired to stand well, was still very bitter towards him. A letter from Atterbury illustrates the situation of affairs:—

'Pray let Père Courayer know that it is in vain to write to any of his friends to see me, and that I am so closely watched by the Cardinal that they dare not. He is persuaded that Père Courayer's escape is owing entirely to me, and acts with such a degree of resentment towards me on that account as does me more honour than I really deserve. I am concerned to find that his acquaintance lies almost entirely one way, though I see not, as things stand with relation to the pension he expects, how it can well be otherwise. Their shyness to him in England is all owing to their desire of managing the Cardinal, who returns the civility to them by his usage of me. There is a kind of bargain between them in this respect, and we shall, for a while at least, mutually feel the effects of it.'[1]

Courayer, however, obtained, after some trouble, a pension of 100*l.* a year from the English Government—one of the rare instances in which services to the Church were recognized during the Georgian era. That he should be honourably treated by the University of Oxford, which had already conferred upon him the degree of D.D., was only to be expected, and accordingly we find him in July 1733 delivering a Latin oration in the Sheldonian Theatre, in which there was quite enough laudation of the Anglican Church to excite the bitter remarks of those who were opposed to her, and to make the liberal-minded French priest the subject of caricatures and lampoons, which it may be hoped did not greatly affect his serene temper. His favour in high places continued steadily to grow. Queen Caroline, a ready patroness of literary talent, doubled his pension, thus making him completely independent, and he repaid her generosity by dedicating to her the first great work which he completed after his arrival in England. This work, though not an original composition, was a valuable contribution to the theological and historical knowledge of the French Church. It was, in fact, a translation into French of Father Paul's great work on the Council

[1] *Correspondence*, iv. 133.

of Trent, with useful critical, historical, and theological notes. It has been observed that it is not a little curious that two of the most famous refugees from Romanist intolerance should both have been connected in England with Father Paul Sarpi's History. Antonio de Dominis, the Archbishop of Spalatro, when in this country in the time of James I., assisted Sir N. Brent in the English translation, and dedicated the book to the King. It had thus been known for more than a century in an English dress, while still concealed from the ordinary French student. This loss Courayer now happily remedied. The work must have been a congenial one to him. Sarpi was a man of kindred spirit with his own, 'one of the humblest things that could be seen within the bounds of humanity,' as Sir Henry Wotton describes him, but excellent in almost every branch of learning, of an admirable courage, an undaunted love of truth, and an unflinching constancy. No man saw the iniquities of Papalism more clearly, or opposed them more temperately, firmly, and learnedly. Courayer well describes him:—

'Like Erasmus, Cassander, De Thou, and other great men, Sarpi was a Catholic in general, and sometimes a Protestant in particulars. He observed everything in the Romish religion which could be practised without superstition; and with respect to those matters concerning which a regard to his duty made him scrupulous, he took great care not to give offence to weak minds. In short, he was equally averse from all extremes, and if he disapproved of the abuses of the Catholics he condemned also the too great heat of the Reformed.'

In translating this work, which was one of the heaviest blows ever inflicted on the modern Romish system, Courayer must have been well aware that he was raising up yet another barrier between himself and the intolerant party which then had sway in the French Church.[1] But the father had now probably abandoned all hope of returning to his native land and the scene of his former labours. His circumstances had become, for his wants, even affluent. With the proceeds of the sale of his *History of the Council of Trent* he purchased an annuity of 100*l.* a year, and this, together with his pension, was far more than he needed for his expenses. It is stated on good authority that he regularly gave from fifty to eighty pounds a year to the poor prisoners, whose needs at that time were very great. He also regularly remitted sums to two nun sisters in France and an elder brother. Yet with

[1] The work was prohibited at Rome. Cardinal Tencin and the Bishop of Auxerre also published mandates against it.

all these contributions his own expenditure was so moderate that he left a good deal of money at his death. Courayer's charming manners and lively conversation made him a great favourite with all the clever ladies, as well as a constant and acceptable visitor at Court. He is said to have spent an evening regularly every week with the Princesses Amelia and Caroline, when their royal father would often join the party, and thoroughly enjoy the mirth and sprightliness which the bright little Frenchman diffused around him. The witty Lady Mary Wortley Montagu has given a humorous description of a visit to the little divine in his lodgings over a toy shop in Holborn, when he appeared in a portentously flowered dressing-gown and a beaver cap with a gold band. Everywhere in society he was received with the greatest cordiality. He was fond of a game of cards, then the universal amusement; and sometimes, it is said, lost his temper when unlucky, upon which occasions he would be careful to explain, 'It is not the money, it is the *conquest*.' But though caressed by the fashionable world the Doctor never swerved from his simple life and from his habits of laborious study. He had taken up a deliberate and intelligible position towards the Anglican Church, and from this he never wavered. He admitted and defended her Catholicity, but, not satisfied with the position which she occupied towards Rome, nor altogether accepting her confession, he could not be induced to conform to her. When in the country he attended the Anglican services, and often spoke in high praise of the Prayer Book, but when within reach of the Romish services he attended them. Neither the injustice with which he had been treated nor the continued harshness extended towards him availed to make him swerve. From the Anglican side there is good reason to believe that he was actually offered a bishopric; on the Romish side it is certain that he was refused confession with a view to absolution, though he regularly presented himself year after year and requested it. The refusal was made on the ground of the publication by the abbot of his order of the declaration that he had incurred the sentence of the greater excommunication. It does not, however, appear that he was formally excommunicated, and in fact there do not seem any possible grounds for such a sentence. Every day, faithful to his priestly habits, he expended an hour in repeating his Breviary, and he gave himself to the study of theology with unabated vigour. In the year 1744 he published at Amsterdam *An Examination of the Defects of Theology, wherein is pointed out the means of reforming them.* The

object of this work was to 'deliver theology from its barbarism and make it more serviceable to religion,' an object eminently characteristic of its author. It was, in fact, here that the great defect of Courayer as a divine began to appear. He was too daring a rationalizer, and was lacking in reverence. He was under the impression that theological dogmas could always be explained and recommended to common sense. He forgot that there is no such thing as absolute common sense; that one man's sense will always differ from another's, and that when we have made, as we suppose, a statement perfectly intelligible and self-evident, an objector will be sure to start up to say that our explanation is more unintelligible than the thing explained. Had Courayer been able to accept with its due logical consequences the dogma of the submission of reason to authority, then he might have rendered to theology as great services as he unquestionably did to ecclesiastical history and polemics, and his theological reputation might have been free from the stain which now unfortunately rests upon it. About the year 1763 overtures were made from the side of the French Church for receiving back the father. The then superior of his order at S. Geneviève sent a message to him, by a person whom he considered trusty, that if he pleased he might be received back into the convent, 'without retractation or submission.' By some strange mischance this message never reached Courayer's ears; but, as at the time of its being sent he had been nearly forty years in England, and had already reached the age of eighty-two, it is probable that he would not have changed again all his habits of life, and left all his English friends, to return among a society of strangers. But though Courayer had reached this great age he gave himself no relaxation in his labours. In 1769 he published at the Hague a French translation, with notes, of Sleidan's *History of the Reformation*, in three vols., 4to. At that time he was almost blind and very deaf. He presented copies of his work to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the University of Oxford. The latter came to the University together with his picture, which (as mentioned above) had belonged to Atterbury and had been by him left to the University. In the confusion, however, into which things fell after the Bishop's death, this bequest had never been carried out. The picture had passed into other hands, but Courayer himself was able to retrieve it, and knowing the Bishop's wishes, which in this case quite coincided with his own, he now sent it to Oxford, together with his translation of Sleidan. The University, which had ever fittingly

honoured the learned French divine, put its seal to a letter of thanks for the donation. Under the picture is the legend which truly characterizes the spirit of the original, 'Quocunque duxit veritas ausus sequi.' Indeed, the 'boldness' was a little more than is expressed by the motto. Courayer was not only bold enough to follow a trusted leader wherever she might conduct him; he was also bold enough to go forth himself as a pioneer or explorer to look for the Truth which he thought had hidden herself; bold enough also not to be turned aside in his search by any impediments, by the respect for old traditions, by the consciousness of human fallibility, by the fear of imperfect judgment. With somewhat too great freedom and self-confidence, with a too presumptuous belief that he could explain all mysteries, did the great historian, the accomplished and fair-minded controversialist, step into the domain of pure theology. There was, however, in the case of Courayer this amount of reticence: that he did not publish the two treatises which have entailed upon him the charge of heterodoxy during his lifetime,[1] but left them to his friend the Princess Amelia, and not, as appears, with any desire that they should be published even after his death. They were rather his speculations, his guesses at truth, his searchings after formulæ which might make Christian doctrine more palatable to human reason, than deliberate statements of opinions by which he was prepared to abide. No doubt doctrinal misstatements of a grave character may be found in them on the doctrines of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation, but the author never consciously separated from the teaching of the Church on these heads. He held that he agreed with the Catholic and orthodox doctrine, but only differed from the common or received way of explaining it. He certainly cannot be fairly claimed by the Socinians, as has been attempted to be done in his Life written by a Socinian biographer, inasmuch as he defended the orthodox writers from the charges made by the Socinians against them. With regard to his doctrine on infant baptism and original sin, though he could not accept the cruel creed of S. Augustine, he did not differ essentially from the teaching of Bishop Jeremy Taylor, who still retains a distinguished place among the orthodox. It must be remembered also that these treatises were the production of Courayer's extreme old age, when he was drawing towards ninety. It is, therefore, emi-

[1] *Declarations of my Latest Opinions on the Different Doctrines of Religion. A Treatise setting forth what the Scripture teaches us of the Divinity of Jesus Christ.*

nently unfair to allow the cloud raised by these last utterances to overshadow all the good work done by the father in his vigorous manhood. It seems to us that the excellent Oxford editor of his *Defence of English Ordinations* is somewhat too severe upon him for his senile aberrations. We may well adopt the words with which Courayer concludes his *Latest Opinions*, and admire at least the spirit which animated him here not less than in his earlier works. 'If I have been deceived it has been in good faith; and I hope that God in His mercy will pardon me involuntary errors, and grant me in the other life the light which shall have been refused me in this.' Courayer's life was protracted to the great age of ninety-five, when he died at his lodgings in Spring Gardens, October 17, 1776. He was buried by his own desire in the cloisters of Westminster Abbey, where a Latin inscription from the pen of Mr. Kynaston, of Brasenose, records the chief facts of his life and the virtues of his character. In his will he professed

'that he died a member of the Catholic Church, but without approving of many of the opinions and superstitions which have been introduced into the Romish Church and taught in their schools and seminaries, and which they have insisted on as articles of faith, though to him they appeared to be not only not founded in truth, but also to be highly improbable.'

There has ever been a succession (alas! too few in numbers) of such truly Catholic-minded men within the Church of Rome; but their efforts have been insufficient to make any permanent impression on the vast mass of centralized dogma which that Church has built up. It is impossible, however, for an English Churchman to contemplate without emotion the noble though unavailing protests of such men as Grosseteste and Hallam and Gascoigne, of Gerson and De Thou, of Erasmus and Cassander, of Sarpi, Courayer, and Lacordaire, beating themselves vainly against the iron network of Roman abuses. They were at any rate delivering their own souls, and the fearful responsibility of enforcing as a condition of Church membership un-Catholic terms of communion must rest on other shoulders. The Roman Church has never ventured to assert dogmatically the invalidity of English orders; but in practice she treats them as invalid, and some of her divines have even ventured in modern times to reproduce the exploded fable of the Nag's Head Consecration.[1] It is for-

[1] E.g. *Facts regarding the Consecration of Matthew Parker, First Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury*, by Archbishop Kenrick (1840), and

tunate that we are able to confront such maligners of our Church with the able, exhaustive, and unanswerable treatise of a member of their own communion, and also to point to the fact that the most learned, judicious, and fair-judging historian of their creed (Dr. Lingard) utterly discards the foolish trash first brought together by Father Champney. It is an undoubted fact that for more than a century and a half after the Reformation the Roman Church did not venture to re-ordain Anglican clergy as though they had been laymen, but merely to pretend to supply what was wanting in their previous orders.[1] In these modern days Romish pretensions have assumed a bolder shape, so that the treatise of Courayer is not obsolete, but is perhaps more needed now than ever. The Oxford editor of this valuable work has taken infinite pains with his subject, and from some little experience we can well appreciate the meaning of his motto 'Labor improbus.' He was hampered not a little by the character of the original translation made by Mr. Williams, a non-juring clergyman, which was very faulty, but which he was not able altogether to discard, inasmuch as Williams had been in personal communication with the author, and had received suggestions from him. Courayer's treatise does not, indeed, possess the admirable spirit of that of Bramhall, the greatest of our controversialists, whose merciless irony and keen wit allow little repose to his opponent; but it is a work of considerable literary excellence as well as of learning, candour, and power, and, taking into consideration its historical surroundings, it would be hard to exaggerate its value.

The Ordination of the Ministers of the Established Church Examined upon Protestant Principles, by the Rev. H. Smith (1841); Haddan's Bramhall, vol. iii. preface).

[1] The first reordained, as from a lay status, was John Gordon, Bishop of Galloway, in 1704. See Haddan's note to Bramhall, vol. iii. p. 114.

ART. V.—THE WORK OF THE LONDON LAY HELPERS' ASSOCIATION.

1. *Sixteenth Annual Report* (1881–2) *of the Association of Lay Helpers for the Diocese of London.* (London, 1882.)
2. *Hints to Church Workers.* (London, 1873.)
3. *Is it Utopian? A Plea for the Evangelization of the Masses by Voluntary Lay Help.* By the Rev. C. BULLOCK. (London.)
4. *Monthly Packet.* Art.—'Mission Work in South Hampstead.' (London, April 1883.)

IN the early days of the Tractarian movement, when the true functions of the Church had been for generations ignored by our rulers in Church and State until they were almost forgotten by the Church herself, when the Church of England was generally spoken of as 'the Establishment,' and even the very idea of the Church Catholic had all but died out of the land, it was not unnatural that the first convulsive effort of the Religious Renaissance should be directed almost exclusively to restoring the idea of the threefold Apostolic ministry as the one and only essential of a Church, properly so called.

Godly laymen of course there were in plenty, but they were only individuals; and the principal experiences which the Church of that day had of combined lay action were the Parliamentary suppression of the ten Irish bishoprics, and the crude reforms applied to the cathedrals. It is no wonder that the thought of Uzzah then rose spontaneously to the clerical mind, and that the clergy shrank instinctively from the laity's 'rude corrective hand.'

The *Lyra Apostolica*, which so faithfully reflects the various moods of that high-strung time, has no word of welcome, no assigned office, for the layman working for the Church as a layman. The Church, impersonated by the priest, is 'of garb austere and dauntless mien,' and the only hope she holds out to her faithful son is a lofty invitation to enter holy orders:—

> 'Another day, dear child, and thou
> Shalt join his sacred band.'

The notion, so familiar to us in this generation, of the Church as a community of fellow-workers for the good of humanity, where the priest does not so much rule as lead, where the

laity are no longer babes in Christ, but grown to manhood, was at any rate not an operative one in the minds of our fathers.

The essential difference between the older and the newer view of the layman's position as to the work of the Church lies in this. The former looked on the clerical portion of the Church as containing its only legitimate motive power, while the latter regards the layman as an integral part of the mystical Body, and therefore entitled to share with the priest in the honour of extending the kingdom of Christ. The one is at most permissive, the other obligatory.

Even so late as 1863, when the general mind was, perhaps almost for the first time, seriously confronted with the unparalleled needs and deficiencies of the Church in London, when it was brought to the notice of the nation that, not to speak of overtaking the consequences of many years' past neglect, the wants of a large city annually added to the metropolis must be annually met; when, to cope with these difficulties, the Bishop of London's Fund was established: even at such a crisis as that there is no mention, in the early papers of the Fund, of enlisting the voluntary services of laymen. The only non-clerical work contemplated is that of the paid lay agent—a cheaper substitute for, rather than a supplement to, the labours of the clergyman.

Before long, however, the earnest men who were raising that Fund became convinced that such a basis was too narrow a one to build upon, and they resolved to organize in the diocese 'a body of laymen of all classes, under the Bishop, to assist the clergy gratuitously, especially those of poor and populous parishes, in various branches of their parochial work.'

As we believe that the diocese of London was the first in which such a definite organization of accredited Church workers was ever established, we may perhaps be allowed to notice its constitution in some detail. Its general object cannot be better explained than in the words of a reply by the late Archbishop of Canterbury (under whom, as Bishop of London, the Association was first formed) to an address presented on December 21, 1868, to His Grace on his elevation to the see of Canterbury:—

'When the Council of the Bishop of London's Fund,' the Archbishop says, 'made a report some four years ago on the spiritual condition of London, its committee pointed out that it would be difficult to multiply clergymen and salaried lay agents in such proportions as would fully meet the wants of our continually growing population, and attention was then directed to the necessity of more

systematically organizing the great amount of lay help which the zeal of our people was ready to afford. Your institution has been formed in the certainty that the clergy will ever find in such unpaid lay agents many of their most valuable assistants.

'Many of your body have, I know, long been at work in your several parishes; what is now desired is to gather all such lay workers more completely into one body, united with the Bishop, and *ready to undertake any duties which may be urgently needed in the Diocese.*'

We wish to draw attention to the concluding words of the Archbishop's reply, as they seem to us to point to a possibility of very great value in diocesan institutions of this nature: we mean the power of directing the whole force of the diocese to a particular work at a particular moment, on some unusual occasion, such as a diocesan mission or other similar work. We hope that the London diocese will not lose sight of this, as we feel sure that the more thoroughly such an association is organized, so that all its members may really feel themselves members of an efficient body, and be ready to march whenever and wherever called upon, the more useful it will be, not only to London, but to the Church of England as a whole.

The diocese of London ranks, it is true, only third among the English dioceses; yet, by virtue of its containing the civil metropolis of the realm, it occupies a unique position in our Church. The Churchmen of London have, therefore, an unexampled opportunity in their Lay Association of exhibiting the power of the Church to assimilate and make use of all the forces of modern society, in the spirit, if not in the details, of our forefathers' ways, and of showing how the 'light and leading' of the Church can guide and co-ordinate not only the ductile, but also the sometimes 'unruly,' wills of good men.

The Bishop is, of course, the President of the Association. The Committee, consisting in about equal proportions of laity and clergy, is appointed annually by the Bishop. The diocese is mapped out into districts conterminous with the Rural Deaneries, and in each of these a District Secretary is appointed by the Committee to represent the Association, conduct its affairs, and promote its objects. In each parish, again, the incumbent is requested to appoint a Parochial Correspondent as his representative in all matters connected with the Association. The organization, therefore, is tolerably complete, and, if the office-bearers be well chosen, it ought to be also effective. It is obvious to remark what strength such a disciplined force of laymen may give to a diocese, either when engaged in their ordinary daily or weekly Church duties, or

when, in Archbishop Tait's words, they are called upon 'to undertake any duties which may be urgently needed in the diocese.'

The qualification for membership is, as it ought to be, the being 'a communicant in the Church of England, and qualified to give lay assistance in parochial work.' Recommendations for admission are made to the Bishop, either by the incumbent or any two members of the Association. The names of members are all entered in the annual list under the parishes in which they work, while a few who are not attached to any particular parish appear in the same list under a 'diocesan' heading. One striking, and to our mind satisfactory, feature is the absence of any, even the smallest, money qualification. The work of the associates, freely given, is freely accepted. The Bishop of London's Fund, on behalf of the diocese, appears to charge itself with the main portion of the annual expense, and the remainder is raised by church collections and donations from friends. Consequently the positions in life of the members run through a diapason almost as wide as that of the world of London itself. The list includes labourers, domestic servants, mechanics, clerks, business and professional men, and noblemen; like the Misericordia of Florence and other brotherhoods of old standing.

From the ranks of the ordinary Lay Helpers we pass on to the Readers. In the diocese of London all Readers are members of the Lay Helpers' Association, so that an intimate connexion is thus kept up between the various orders of lay workers. Readers are admitted in strict accordance with the resolutions of the Archbishops and Bishops passed at Lambeth on Ascension Day, 1866. When nominated to and approved by the Bishop, they are admitted by him to their office by a special service, usually held at Fulham Palace twice a year.

The gradual and steady growth of the system of commissioning Readers may be seen from the fact of their numbers having risen from eleven in 1869 to one hundred and thirty-two in 1879, while the number at present employed is not far short of two hundred. As Readers are commissioned by the Bishop on the application of the incumbents whom they are to assist, we may take these numbers as evidence that the system was well planned at the beginning, and has stood the test of experience. There are upwards of 700 Readers in the various dioceses of England. In the American Episcopal Church there are at least 1,000 Readers similarly licensed.

Besides the ordinary Parochial Readers, the Bishop has also in a few exceptional cases appointed 'Mission Readers' under a commission which entitles 'the holder to conduct Mission Services under the superintendence of the Association of Lay Helpers for the Diocese of London.' This privilege is accorded only after examination by a board of examiners appointed by the Bishop. This seems rather a cumbrous method of making a distinction where there is scarcely any difference. Would it not be a simpler plan to hold an examination, say, once a year, which should be open to all Readers to enter for at their discretion? Those who passed would become *ipso facto* practically Mission Readers. A certificate of having passed such an examination would be highly valued, and would give, not only a certain status to the holder, but also a little more stability to the office of Reader. It would also, we think, attract men of superior attainments and higher social position to seek for the Readership, while the Bishop might safely trust such men to work on Church lines, under a few very simple regulations: the chief of which would be, not to exercise the office in any parish except with the consent of the incumbent. We believe that such a step—and it would be a very slight advance—would be of great service in welding together the immense disorganized teaching and preaching power now irregularly exercised by many laymen.

An interesting feature in connexion with these Mission Readers must not be passed over without notice. One of them is an officer in the mercantile marine, and was commissioned for work on board ship, the diocese of London comprehending not only the county of Middlesex but the high seas also. A field of mission labour, 'white for the harvest,' and vast enough to satisfy the spiritual zeal of a S. Francis Xavier, opens before the mind at the thought of the single Reader commissioned for this work. We hope he may soon be joined by many others. What a glory it would be for the Church of England if it were usual for the captains of our mercantile navy (and why not our Royal navy also?) to hold their Bishop's commission as Readers; if holy words 'which accompany salvation,' instead of oaths and blasphemies, were the first which heathen lips learnt from Englishmen!

To turn to another field of activity: we must draw attention to the laudable efforts made by this Association to improve the intellectual and spiritual attainments of the Readers not only of their own, but also of other dioceses. For a month in the summer of 1881, and also in that of 1882, the authorities of Keble College, Oxford, liberally opened their

buildings to all Readers wishing to embrace the opportunity of instruction and retirement. A committee, composed of certain members of the Lay Helpers' Association committee and a few others, organized the movement, settled the scale of payments, collected the names of intending students, and appointed a Principal (Dr. Boyd, Principal of Hertford College, in 1881, and Mr. Inge, Provost of Worcester College, in 1882). From this point it was taken up by Oxford, and the Principal, enlisting a willing band of tutors and professors, arranged the course of study. It is not to be supposed that a great deal of actual instruction can have been given in so short a time, but it may have been possible to lay the foundation of future methodical reading which will bear fruit in years after; and even a week's residence at Oxford must have been something of a 'liberal education.' The Reports of the Lay Helpers' Association for the last two years give full details of these interesting occasions. A similar course is being held at this moment at Selwyn College, Cambridge, under the principalship of Chancellor Leeke, of Lincoln. We have dwelt rather fully on this course of training for Readers as the work is an important one in itself, if Readers are to come up to the standard which may be expected of them before long; and also because it seems as if, in its chief outlines, the plan might with advantage be adopted elsewhere. Indeed, something of the sort was done at Lichfield Theological College last autumn.

But while the Association has been thus occupied with the Readers it has not neglected the improvement of the general body of Lay Helpers. Courses of lectures for members have been held in the winter at S. Paul's Cathedral; and evening services at the same locality hold a conspicuous place in the arrangements of the year. Among these services may be mentioned an annual day of prayer and meditation in Lent, attended by between two and three hundred members. This is a modification of the 'Retreat' which seems from its steady growth to meet the wants, and yet to be compatible with the engagements, of the busy man of the present day. This series of services is closed and crowned by the annual Communion of the Association at S. Paul's. On the 26th of last June more than five hundred members communicated, and an address was given by the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The arrangements of the diocese of London are of course made with reference to a large city, but there are in England at least three other cathedral cities—Liverpool, Manchester, and Newcastle—which may bear some comparison with Lon-

don, and where a similar organization should bear similar fruit. In these and other dioceses some such system as the above might be applied to the urban, and modified to suit the rural districts.

We have given a sketch of a fairly complete system for the organization of lay work, which exists not only on paper, but in a state of active vitality. (The London Lay Helpers' Association numbered, at the time of the issue of the last Report, 3,669 members.) This system is capable of large development in many directions. And here we think the clergy have the matter very much in their own hands. If they will lay hold of this organization where it exists, and create it where it does not, they may by its means raise the Church of England to a position which it has never yet occupied in the nation either before or since the Reformation. The clergy of our Church, leading an attached, intelligent, and active laity, would be an irresistible force at home, and might even guide Churches abroad into the true way of bringing back their people to the faith of Christ.

The Spirit of God is stirring the hearts of thousands of young men to be up and doing, in all departments of spiritual, ecclesiastical, and social amelioration, and they look to the Church of their fathers to guide them in their aspirations. And not only the children of the Church; but even those whom accident of birth or of circumstances has outwardly separated from her are in many cases no longer alienated in heart. A hand of welcome pointing out to them the place, the sphere, in the Church waiting for them to fill, and a voice capable of claiming their allegiance, would bring them in numbers to range themselves under the Church's banner. Will the clergy rise to their high opportunity?

But it is no mere triumph of one communion over another that we desire to promote by calling out the power of the laity in the war against evil. We hope it will do something towards reuniting the scattered fragments into which the Church of Christ in our country has been shivered. It is inevitable that the clergy of the Church, as of other contending religious bodies, should occupy themselves a good deal with the points which divide the several communions. The more torpid laity are less interested in these particulars, and even when engaged in good works will be more employed about matters which unite than those which divide Christians from one another. It may therefore be reasonably hoped that when laymen, now perhaps even too much inclined to 'peace at any price' in Church matters, are stirred up to

activity, the lay and the clerical minds may mutually act and react on one another, and the things which make for peace may obtain as much attention as differences have hitherto received, and that our unhappy divisions may be gradually diminished as more and more of the laity find scope for their energy in the abundant field which the Church has to offer. But these are far-reaching hopes; let us try what can be done, even now, with the material we have at hand.

In his *Plea for the Evangelization of the Masses by Voluntary Lay Help*, Mr. Bullock strongly and sensibly urges the concentration of the energies of any particular parish or association on the cultivation of a poor, neglected but manageable district. After referring to days when it was thought enough to plant one City Missionary in a district containing 2,000, 5,000, or even 10,000 people, he continues:—

'Better almost to do nothing than not to do what we do, well. Better proclaim openly the heathen state of a parish or district than administer in this form an opiate which serves only to arrest Christian effort, because it conveys to the minds of the laity the impression that things are not as they really are. No clergyman should even profess to take the spiritual charge of a parish of 10,000 souls with one or even two churches, and perhaps—though not always found in the most needy and poverty-stricken districts—a Dissenting Chapel. As well might a City merchant profess to do personally the business which demands at least a dozen helpers. The announcement on the doors of the Church, "No spiritual provision whatever is made in this parish for half the population," would be a far more sensible course to pursue than to continue, by means of begging sermons for a City Missionary's stipend, to foster the delusion that the parish is cared for, and the responsibilities of Christian laymen at an end.

'I am persuaded that whilst the clergy themselves in these overgrown parishes are bearing a burden which serves to paralyse their energies rather than stimulate them to what might be done, the laity too are suffering a great wrong in being deprived of their fitting share in a noble Christ-like enterprise.'

'I do not think,' he adds, 'spasmodic evangelistic effort will accomplish what is needed. Unquestionably outdoor preaching and theatre preaching and mission services have been in many instances most useful. But the benefit is partial, and often evanescent. Such services do not secure the association of Christians in Church fellowship which in Christian effort seems to be the step of all others most important if the work begun is to be a lasting benefit in the neighbourhood. The New Testament plan was to plant churches or congregations "in every city." The Apostles, wherever they went, left at least "two or three" who might henceforward gather together in Christ's name, and exercise a missionary influence on those around them. Stability, not excitement, should ever be kept in view. Mul-

titudes may be easily gathered—and as easily dispersed. Evangelistic services begun and continued only so long as the excitement of novelty keeps up the attendance are often followed by a reaction, which is a sad makeweight against whatever individual benefit may have arisen.'

The problem is a really difficult one. We have a scanty and over-worked clergy, a greatly under-worked laity, and a practically heathen population. The ordinary organization of the Church is perhaps sufficient for church-goers; but, large as it is, it can only be considered satisfactory by shutting our eyes to the enormous mass of people who are still untouched by it. Additional forces, it is admitted on all hands, must be brought into action; and of these the Church has abundance if she will rightly direct them.

One thing must be kept steadily in view by Churchmen in all methods used for bringing the gospel to bear practically on those still beyond its immediate influence: namely, that the parish church is the centre from which all sanctifying influences should flow, and to which they should return. In casting the net wide some of our plans may not seem to lead there directly; but if the 'fisher of men' have a steady hand and a clear eye he will draw his net and all that it contains surely, if slowly, to the shore.

What has been tried, even if tried in many places, may not necessarily be the best plan conceivable, but the frequent adoption of one class of methods points to a felt necessity for something of the kind. It is from this point of view that we look at the Mission Room which is now so often a part of the machinery of a well-worked parish. It is no doubt sometimes used as a practical substitute for the church, where the poor may feel themselves comfortable among themselves, and where they are allowed to rest without being led on to the higher sacramental gifts with which the Church might aid their spiritual growth; but it may be, and often is, used as a true auxiliary to the parish church.

Anyone who has read the *Monthly Packet* of April last, or, still better, anyone who has attended the Mission Chapel in South Hampstead there described, can form some idea of the innumerable Church activities which may be created by and gathered round such a centre. Mr. Mackeson, a Reader in the diocese of London, began his work there a few years ago in a room capable of containing, say, four hundred children. The Sunday school, begun with a few waifs and strays from the streets, has now outgrown the Mission Room, and the neighbouring Board school has been hired to accom-

modate the overflow. The Sunday school has been so well organized and taught that it has been invaded by the fathers of the scholars, and a class for their instruction has been formed, which now meets in considerable numbers on Sunday mornings. A choral evening service closes a day which has been almost continuously spent from an early hour in services, classes, and meetings of all kinds. The clergy of the parish visit the Mission Chapel from time to time to strengthen the hands of the missioner, and to attest the strictly Church character of the work there. But they do not administer the Holy Communion there; periodically the Reader brings the communicants who have been 'added to the Church' by means of the Mission Room, and who are now numbered, not by tens, but by hundreds, to an early communion at the parish altar.

We have thought that one example of good work which has been really done was worth a dozen suggestions as to what might be done. Similar good work is, no doubt, doing elsewhere; but it has been convenient to refer especially to the work in South Hampstead as it is a conspicuous instance, and our readers can easily fill up our outline by referring to the pages of the *Monthly Packet.*

Some drawbacks, no doubt, may be found, and more apprehended, in missionary Church work conducted on the system adopted in the parish we have just spoken of. The first, and perhaps the most obvious, is the danger of such work being carried on in a spirit of independence of, if not covert opposition to, the clergyman of the parish. To this it may be replied that the regulations of the diocese of London relating to Readers have hitherto been sufficient to prevent any such danger in practice.

Another drawback may be apprehended in the withdrawal from the church congregation of its most active elements to the more exciting work of the Mission Chapel. Such a result is undoubtedly possible; but we cannot think that the mission work of a parish can ever be full of life unless it be an overflow of the zeal abounding in the congregation of the parish church itself.

We have noticed and sketched out above plans which have been or may be adopted at once, and which we consider suitable for 'the present distress.' But we should like to face the matter boldly, and ask why our churches should not themselves be our mission rooms. The difficulties in the way are no doubt great—amongst them, not always the least, the prejudices of respectable congregations—but if this de-

sirable end were more kept in view by all concerned, the realization of this object might be nearer than we think.

The large congregations of what are called non-church-going people gathered in churches during some parochial missions point to the fact that their supposed aversion to entering an actual church may not be so deep-rooted as is often supposed. The frequent failures of these momentary successes is more often, we fear, to be attributed to the reversion of the church officials to their ordinary round of duties after the mission than to absolute unwillingness on the other side to enter church doors. An amusing story on this point was told by one of the speakers at the late London Diocesan Conference. The clergyman of a pew-rented church had, in preparation for a mission, cleared the seats of all private property in the shape of books (and probably hassocks too). Some few weeks after the close of the mission, which had been very successful, he consulted his clerk as to the propriety of replacing these articles. 'No, sir, not yet,' was the clerk's reply; 'it will take at least three weeks more to get rid of that lot you got in at the mission.'

But until the time come when the clergy will be willing to break through the bonds of habit and use their churches more, and more freely, than they do, we think the Mission Chapel a most valuable and indeed indispensable adjunct to the church. Its 'outpost' services should be conducted by the Reader, who would gather round him male and female fellow-workers. Their business would be to crowd the parish day schools with children, while on Sundays and weekday evenings, he would with their help instruct both old and young in the rudiments of the gospel, present such, if still unbaptized, at the church for holy baptism; then, after a greater or less interval, bring them again to the parish priest for instruction preparatory to confirmation (in which work he will probably himself assist his pastor); he will accompany them to their confirmation by the Bishop, and gradually absorb them into the general congregation of the parish church.

But if the laity are to be employed in a more authorized manner than hitherto, and to the lasting, as distinguished from the immediate and evanescent, benefit of the Church, the foundations of the system must be well laid. In many a large parish the energies of the incumbent would probably be better expended in the careful preparation of a few godly laymen for such work as this than in hurrying hither and thither, vainly attempting to do the impossible; distracted alike in pastoral visitation, school teaching, and church ser-

vices. This good foundation once laid, in the previous training of the laymen to be employed in the public ministrations of the parish, we think there need be no fear of confusion arising in the minds of the parishioners as to the limits of the respective spheres of layman and priest. Rather we think it would tend to distinguish them from one another.

Once more, if lay work of this sort is to be set going to good effect it must be done in no hesitating or half-hearted spirit. It must be done in that spirit which ensures success in great mercantile establishments, where the head reigns, and governs too, but where each subordinate has his own well-defined sphere of work in which he is the trusted representative of his chief: a sphere in which he is allowed to work without vexatious restrictions to take the heart out of him; a sphere in which, being trusted, he gladly welcomes the master's eye and advice, but in which he is at the same time free to act within well-understood limits on his own responsibility, so as to be able with honest confidence to give his work to his master as, in some degree, his own offering.

The spiritual torpor of a past age overcame priest and layman alike, with a few bright exceptions in both ranks. The religious awakening of fifty years ago, though it affected both clergy and laity, yet chiefly took the clerical line, and, as we said at the outset, lay energy was rather absorbed than made use of by the clergy. Of late years, however, the piety of laymen has seemed to be conscious (some might perhaps think even too conscious) of its own dignity; it has vindicated—perhaps we might say, in some cases, asserted—itself with sufficient energy. It has now and then reminded the clergy of the strict meaning of their title of 'ministers' of the Church; at times stretching the meaning of the term as if it implied that they were to be the servants of the laity. But, notwithstanding some partial exaggeration here and there, the heart of the laity is sound and loyal to their clergy, and the clergy, if they will exercise a little patience and tact may have an almost unlimited amount of help from their people if they will but give them the only payment the laity care for—confidence.

We feel certain that a layman, well trained beforehand and trusted with the charge of such a mission as has been suggested above, would not be likely to cause his clergyman anxiety by the assumption of clerical airs or importance. The fact of being accredited as an agent of the Church is what a layman values in such a post: once so recognized, he will work with a will and need no more. He can forget

himself now, for he is no longer only Mr. X. labouring in an isolated cause: he is associated with the Catholic Church of Jesus Christ in her world-long work of the salvation of souls.

The clergy must, however, expect that work of this sort, when done by the laity, will be more impressed with the individuality of the worker than clerical work is. A clergyman on entering a parish succeeds to a church with its Prayer Book services, from the regular round of which he can scarcely, if at all, vary. The layman, on the contrary, starts with a *tabula rasa*; he is sent expressly to work on a virgin soil, on souls which have either never attended, or have long forsaken, their church. His mode of operation must, therefore, necessarily to a great extent reflect his own personality, however closely he follows the general lines of the Church. And if he be successful, his popularity and influence must always be of a more personal sort than that of a clergyman. And here we are brought face to face with what we fear is sometimes, at any rate, a great stumbling-block in the way of a layman's work in any parish. We will not say that the incumbent becomes jealous of his Reader's success, but it often seems to the Reader that he does so; at any rate it sometimes, we think, makes him a little uncomfortable. We wish it to be understood that, in saying so much, we are not speaking 'without book.' In a series of letters from lay missioners in various parts of England, the constant complaint is of clerical jealousy and unnecessary restrictions placed in the way of successful missions. The complaint is too general to be without some foundation. It is, perhaps, not unnatural that some such feeling should exist on the part of the incumbent. It is inevitable that if the layman be a man of any power his work will produce a stir in his district. It may not really be better than that of the clergyman, but it strikes people's imagination more, and from its comparative rarity gets more talked about. We beg the clergy to accept any success of their lay workers cordially, ungrudgingly, and as part of the Church's work in their parishes—a work of which they are the heads and the lay workers only the subordinate instruments.

We repeat that the clergyman's opportunity for minute interference, control, settling of details, and general 'breaking-in' must be the preliminary period of preparation suggested above. Labour spent in that work would be repaid tenfold, but when the clergyman has once intrusted his layman with the charge of a mission he should 'guide him

with the eye' only. Better not give him the work at all than wear him out with bit and bridle, when undivided attention ought to be given to 'going forward.'

Another hindrance to lay work much felt by the laity, though, we believe, little suspected by the clergy, arises from the opposite cause: viz. the very confidence reposed in the lay missioner by his parish priest. It not unfrequently happens that when the latter has put a mission into the hands of a layman whom he knows he can trust, he so thoroughly trusts him with it that he never again looks after it, sometimes does not even inquire after it. This may (perhaps ought to) be taken by the layman as a compliment, but it more often acts as a wet blanket. It is a curious and unexpected instance of that loss of sympathy with the lay mind which often creeps over the clergy, and to which the pressure of their too multifarious duties inevitably renders them more and more liable as they become more and more absorbed in their sacred duties. The fact is that the actual (as distinguished from the imaginary) layman is more willing to be led than the clergyman often is to lead. Therefore we bespeak on behalf of all and sundry lay missioners and workers, and most of all on behalf of the most trusted, kindly visits of supervision from time to time and (when deserved) a few well-timed words of recognition and thanks.

In the above remarks we have made but little mention of women's work for the Church. It was not necessary to do so. Their praise is in all the Churches. There is scarcely a parish in the whole land where the greater part of the lay work is not done by women. In all ages they have been foremost in God's work; and in the revival in our own Church they have, with the happy adaptability of their sex, found out the forms of work most suited to themselves. In sisterhoods, as deaconesses, and in many other modes they have led the way to all good deeds. With men the case has been different. It has therefore been the more needful to dwell on this branch of the subject almost exclusively.

In giving a somewhat detailed account of one conspicuous instance of diocesan organization of lay work we do not wish it to be supposed that this is a solitary instance. The work begun in London is being taken up in other dioceses, especially Rochester and the North, and will soon be taken up also in Dublin. These and similar associations should be of great interest to the clergy, for they undoubtedly attract a portion of their number towards holy orders. Instances not a few have come to our knowledge of men in the ranks of

the London Lay Helpers' Association who have gladly resigned positions of competence and excellent worldly prospects for assured poverty in the army of the Cross, either at home or in the colonies; and of those who remain in the ranks of the laity the majority are year by year becoming more and more fitted to assist the clergy as Readers or—whenever our rulers shall see fit to call them to such an office—as subdeacons.

There is yet one more and, to our minds, very weighty reason for urging this whole subject on the notice of the Church at large. Those who read the signs of the times—*i.e.* passing events and their tendencies—with neither optimist nor pessimist prejudices, but with the sober confidence in their faith which befits Christians, believe that there are not wanting indications that the Church, notwithstanding all difficulties, is surely spreading wider and rooting deeper among our people. She is, we devoutly believe, the ultimate heir of all the spiritual gifts now scattered among the various religious bodies in our land. But, among the various defects which have tended to repel many from returning to her communion, one main hindrance has been the want of that defined work and status for laymen which is so abundantly supplied in dissenting communities. We therefore throw out the above hints and suggestions in the earnest desire that, at this hopeful moment of her fortunes, the Church will not be found wanting to her great destiny; that she will improve her own organization, so as to make full use of the potential energy of her laity, and will thus be able to offer a home of noble, well-ordered, restful activity, not only to her own children, but to the many who, now wearied and 'driven about by every wind of strange doctrine,' are looking to her as the true haven of their souls.

ART. VI.—EVOLUTION, ETHICS AND RELIGION.

1. *The Science of Ethics.* By LESLIE STEPHEN. (London, 1882.)
2. *Mind,* Nos. xxvii., xxviii., xxix. (London, 1882–3.)

WE are late in noticing the important contribution to ethical science which has been made by Mr. Leslie Stephen. But the delay is so far of advantage that it has given us the opportunity of perusing certain communications which the

work has called forth from thinkers of great authority upon the question, of whom we may name especially Mr. Sidgwick and Professor Bain.

The essay of Mr. Stephen is, as one of these writers has remarked, a difficult book to review. Coming as it does from one of our most skilful artists in words, it possesses literary excellence of a very high character. Indeed, we will venture the criticism that the style of the work is more literary than scientific. The subject of ethics is one which naturally tempts a literary man to this defect. It affords endless opportunity for dissertations and enlargements, which cannot, indeed, be pronounced either irrelevant or uninteresting, but which obscure rather than assist the distinct grasp of the stages of the argument. And the result is like a long journey over a road in Holland, in which everything we see is well ordered and elegant, but we are led to few commanding points of view.

In noticing a work of this character we had better give up at once the idea of conveying to a reader disinclined to grapple with the book itself any general notion of its contents. It must suffice to say that the problem which the author sets himself is 'to discover the scientific form of morality; or, in other words, to discover what is the general characteristic, so far as science can grasp it, of the moral sentiments.'[1] What Mr. Stephen means by science may also be best explained by the words of his preface,[2] in which he describes his work as 'an attempt to lay down an ethical doctrine in harmony with the doctrine of evolution so widely accepted by modern men of science.'

The method of treatment which we feel most within our competence, as well as most likely to be useful to the reader, is to select one point of undoubted importance in ethical science, and to inquire what aid in the resolution of this point is afforded us by the work under review. And such a point we find in the great question of the relation of morals to religion. In common, probably, with many of our readers, we find ourselves in constant contact with the question how morality is to be maintained and advanced. And, amidst many differences in detail and application, we all return the same general reply—that religion is the instrument for the increase of morality in which we put our trust and which we profess to use. The reply is not certainly considered absurd or irrelevant by the mass of mankind. The medical profession is not more generally regarded as the natural guardians of the nation's

[1] P. 35. [2] P. 7.

health than religious teachers of its morals. And while multitudes in our time disbelieve not only our religion but any religion, it is a remarkable fact that no distinct method of advancing morality other than the religious method possesses any currency or acceptance in our general social system. For ourselves we find our method in many ways miserably ineffective; yet it yields so much success as to assure us that failures are due, not to the insufficiency of the remedy, but to the way in which it is prescribed by the spiritual physician or used by his patients. Nor if we give up the religious method of promoting morality do we find any other whatever presented for our use. The alternative offered us is to rest in the belief that the social system, having brought morality to its present stage, will complete its work without the aid of any special agency; a theory better fitted to satisfy the philosopher in his study than to help men who desire to do their part in practical life.

We do not for a moment forget the lofty ideal of morality maintained and exemplified by many who do not believe in religion, nor do we underrate the aids to morality which would be afforded by removing impediments that hinder the social system and the powers of the individual from acting and reacting on one another in a free and natural manner. But in the actual condition of the world's mind, these impediments cannot be cleared away without the aid of religion. And after all that can be done to restore life to its natural working there is still, and so far as we can discern there ever will be, need that morality should appeal to the spirit and will of man with a direct force, which neither nature nor society furnishes, but which is provided by religion.

We must needs, therefore, regard with extreme interest any serious treatment of the science of ethics. We belong to the class of persons who are to put the science into immediate practical use, and we claim that kind of consideration for our experiences and our requirements which practical agriculturists have a right to from those who treat of the chemistry of agriculture. But it is doubtful how far Mr. Stephen would give attention to any appeal for aid in the practical advancement of morality. He declares that

'The scientific moralist has fulfilled his task when he has explained what virtue and vice actually are, what are their normal consequences to society and the individual, and what are the conditions under which they are generated. He has done all that he can do if he has laid down true propositions on such matters.'[1]

[1] P. 436.

It is certainly in one sense undeniable that to explain what virtue and vice really are exhausts the task of the scientific moralist. We might even go further, and say that it exhausts the task of the practical moralist too. What plea for good conduct can be presented to any man which may not be described as a demonstration to him what virtue and vice really are? Beyond this no teacher can go; he cannot make men accept his teaching and become moral, any more than a physician can compel men to take his physic and be well. But this obvious distinction between precept and practice must not be pressed so far as to claim the title of ethical for treatises which have no practical tendency whatever, and are, in truth, only studies in the natural history of man.

A treatise might be written upon the origin and development of the ideas which are used in mathematics. But it is plain that such a work would be classed as metaphysical, not as mathematical. Mathematical treatises take for granted the existence of the ideas, and show how they may be exercised. So, to our thinking, it is with ethics. A work upon the origin of ethical ideas is not a work on ethics. Ethical works take man as a moral being. They disengage his moral notions, and show what they imply, to what they lead, and what is their relation to other faculties. Thus, though not directly practical, ethics has the same kind of connection with practice which mathematics has with engineering. It concerns itself with the exercise of moral faculties which have an undoubted place in the human constitution, and which are of an excessively practical character. And the history of the origin of these faculties is as different a thing from the theory of their exercise as the history of the British constitution is from a treatise on the rights and duties of British citizens.

We do not, therefore, believe that any science of ethics can be founded on evolution. Evolution may or may not give us the true key to the development of man's moral faculties. But the contemplation of this development is a different thing from the exercise of the faculties themselves, while the process of evolution is confessedly so difficult and obscure that even the most assured believer in the theory may well doubt whether it is not far easier to regard the faculties as they exist under our eyes, than to expect any light upon their proper exercise from a history so remote and so liable to mistake as that of their origin and development.

Are we even so absolutely sure that the evolution hypothesis affords a complete account of the genesis of the moral faculties as to be able to build our conception of their nature

upon the ascertained certainties of their history? It is surprising that scientific men should maintain such a proposition. Even in the physical sphere we believe that the utmost to be said for the theory of evolution is that it is certain there is something in it. It cannot be denied that there are gaps in the system and room for additions and corrections which may impart to it for minds in the future a different complexion from that which it wears for us now. But when we come to the subject of morals and religion, the imperfections in the proof of the evolution hypothesis are still more apparent. We grant that here also it is quite sure that there is something in it. But when we compare the requirements which an hypothesis in any branch of physics is required to answer ere it passes muster before scientific minds with the proofs which the evolution hypothesis has given of its sufficiency in the region of ethics, we seem to be passing from sunlight to fog. The derivation of man's moral characteristics from evolution has never, so far as our experience goes, been traced without in the first place assuming the truth of the hypothesis. Evolution being presumed as the source of all life, writers have described the process by which the particular department of life which we call morals has been evolved.

And there is no doubt but that some of the phenomena lend themselves to this process, and fall very naturally into their place in a history framed on such a basis. No doubt the expression of moral ideas in developed man finds a likeness in the lower animals which establishes some kind of connexion between the two. No doubt the forms and practical working of the moral faculties grow, expand, and change with the progress of society. And this is sufficient to show that the evolution hypothesis accounts for some of the phenomena. But just in the same way the Ptolemaic system accounted for some of the phenomena of astronomy. The question to which true science demands an answer is whether it accounts for all. And this is the question which the advocates of the evolution hypothesis in morals have never, to our knowledge, attempted to face.

The historical method, as applied by these moralists, has a peculiar meaning which must not at all be confounded with the historical method as applied in politics and other such departments of inquiry. If a writer professes to account for the origin of the political character of the English nation by its past history, we understand at once that he will assume as a basis certain given principles of human nature, and will be satisfied with showing how these original principles have,

by the course of the history, been cast into a certain mould. But the evolutionist can assume nothing but mere life, if even that. He professes to account, by the help of history, not merely for the mould into which given principles have been cast, but for the principles themselves. Given a lump of matter which displays just the rudiments of life, I will show you how it evolves a moral man; such is his problem.

The origin of things is, according to these writers, unknown and unknowable. The actual characters of things and of men alike find their cause in the course of preceding facts. Once the current of evolution has been started on its way, its unknown origin passes out of regard, and has no share in accounting for things as they are.

It is in this sense that Mr. Stephen looks to the historical method, when generally adopted and fully carried out, to bring about an approximation to agreement in ethics and politics. When we cease to ask 'What is the moral?' and ask only 'what men have actually admired,' then the true nature of the thing may reveal itself. Mr. Sidgwick replies:—

'The true nature of the thing is in this case the true answer to the ethical question, What is ultimately right or good? and if Mr. Stephen holds that the examination, on however large a scale, of men's opinions as to what is right and good will supply a cogently-reasoned answer to this question, I can only entreat him to state explicitly and fully the steps of the reasoning by which this result is reached, since I have long and vainly sought for such a statement in the most elaborate treatises of the historical school.'[1]

We may safely predict that the search might be carried on for ever without obtaining a more satisfactory reply. And for this simple reason: that the substitution of the question 'what men have actually admired' for the question What is moral? would by its very terms set aside the question What is ultimately right and good? Men themselves have ever drawn the sharpest distinction between that which men, however many, admire, and that which is ultimately right and good; and to the latter alone have they applied the term moral. And to confess that your method requires the suppression of the question What is moral? is to confess that your method is not an ethical method at all. This is what we firmly believe the professors of the evolution method will one day be obliged

[1] *Mind*, No. xxviii. p. 586. The passage alluded to by Mr. Sidgwick is perhaps not quite so decided in its appeal to history (*Science of Ethics*, p. 448), since Mr. Stephen admits that there is 'something more to be done.' But as we read on we find that this something more is only the appeal to history over again.

to admit. Even if they gave us the history of morals, that would not be the science of morals.

However, if it be a history of morals, it ought to record all the phenomena of the history. Now, what fair-minded man, be he believer or unbeliever, can maintain that the phenomena of the evolution of morals have been fully stated by writers who completely ignore the connexion of morals and religion? In the facts of our social system, as we have stated them above, there is surely *primâ facie* ground for believing that there is a connexion between these two things. The worst taunt that evolutionists have to throw at religion is that it is based upon ideas and not upon facts. They must not leave themselves open to the same objection by ignoring the connexion between religion and morality just because their own theory does not admit such a connexion as real. If this connexion be not one of the facts 'which science can grasp,' such science is wanting in the completeness which gives it a right to its name.

We learn from a few hints at the conclusion of Mr. Stephen's work[1] in what spirit he would treat this subject. He calls it 'the vast problem or series of problems which arise as to the connexion between morality and religion,' yet no more than 'only the briefest glance' is possible for him on a subject which 'suggests at once whole libraries of controversy and lifetimes of investigation.' Difficult, however, as the question may be, it must palpably be treated in the most complete fashion by anyone who would propound a science of ethics. A religion, as Mr. Stephen truly says, 'rests upon some doctrine as to the ultimate facts ascertainable about human life and the world in which we live; and therefore of course every moral theory is based upon or at least closely implicated in the religious doctrines of the persons who hold it.' How, then, can Mr. Stephen be right in treating the morals of a race which, as a whole, have unquestionably believed in religion as if their religion had been but a kind of imaginative addition to the proper motives of morality? Men who hold that the universe is under supernatural influence are bound *ipso facto* to believe that morality has reference to a supernatural will, and they cannot accept the theory which Mr. Stephen briefly but sufficiently states in the words 'Morality is a product of the social factor,' and 'the ethical sentiment becomes stable and demonstrable when that which is the real cause of its development is recognized as being also its sufficient reason.'[2] The facts of life are in our

[1] P. 457 *sqq.* [2] Pp. 454–460.

favour when we decline to admit the accuracy of this genesis of morality. It has not been a product of the social factor; nor has that factor been its real cause.

We are very well aware that the mere fact of a present apparent connexion of morality and religion does not suffice to prove such a connexion essential and indispensable. In talking of evolution we must allow periods of time of a practically unlimited extent. And changes which the mind of man is now unable to grasp may come to pass in ages so vast. Let us admit that the failures of religion as a moral agent and the value and efficiency of moral agencies which are merely secular and social render the essential nature of the connexion of morality and religion a debatable question. If we consent to admit that the appearances of this connexion are not absolutely decisive on the side of religion, much more must the unbeliever allow that the cases of morality existing among us without religion are of the slightest possible worth in deciding the question on the side of unbelief. Mr. Stephen has himself invented the phrase 'social tissue' as indicating the existence of a general mind and spirit which overrules individuals. In relation to this social tissue the beliefs and the acts of an individual in the community must be as unimportant as a passing thought or a petty impression are in relation to the general condition of a man's mind and body. If the social tissue is religious and if, on Mr. Stephen's principle, above stated, the social morality be therefore based upon religion, the irreligion of a few, however true they may be to the approved standard of morality, is a fact of very slight importance in the controversy.

That we may not assume anything we shall take the statement of the case presented by a writer so little prejudiced as the younger Lange: 'Scientifically speaking, nothing is ascertained as to the moral effect of belief and unbelief in themselves.'[1]

That is a statement of the condition of the question which may probably appear to Christian readers extravagantly unfair to the faith. Indeed, we hold that it is unfair. For the question whether morals could be sustained without belief cannot be said ever to have been tried. In order to put it to a genuine test, it would plainly be necessary to eliminate not merely Christian or theistic belief, but all apprehension of the supernatural, to a degree of which few specimens can really be found even among those who are called unbelievers. And this absence of belief must be exhibited not merely in

[1] *History of Materialism*, vol. iii. p. 274 (Eng. trans.)

a few individuals educated in Christianity[1] and subjected to all the moral influences of a believing community, and put on their mettle to prove that their principles are not destructive of morality; nor even in an unbelieving community inheriting religious predispositions; but in a community out of whose social tissue religion has been purged by the lapse of a period of time which we shall not attempt to estimate, but which must be sufficient to work a change so vast in the general mind of man as to divest him of all remaining influences from the religion of his past. Against the possible result of this possible experiment we have to put the actual fact which the same writer allows:—

'If we survey the whole course of history, it seems to me to be scarcely doubtful that we may in great part attribute to the quiet but continual operation of Christian ideas not merely our moral but even our intellectual progress; and yet that these ideas can only develop their full activity by bursting asunder the ecclesiastical and dogmatic form in which they have been enclosed as the seed of a tree in its hard shell.'

We shall not argue about the latter sentence. Whatever be burst asunder or be cast aside, the ideas which remain must, according to this author, be genuine Christian ideas in order to give the world the moral power which, according to his reading of its past history, has been hitherto derived from religion. Science must surely recognize in these circumstances, if not a demonstration of the respective moral effects of belief and unbelief in themselves, yet certainly a considerable presumption on the side of belief. Let us, however, accept for the moment the statement that the point is scientifically undetermined; the opinion may be allowed at all events in this sense—that no writer, so far as we are aware, has yet balanced the facts and arguments of this great debate with a thoroughness sufficient to decide the question. But, if the question be undecided, how absolutely unscientific must be such works as those of Mr. Stephen which draw out a whole system of ethics and call it a science without taking the slightest notice of the subject of religion! They are leaving behind them unresolved a question the response to which may possibly overthrow all their speculations.

For our own part, we feel confident that the investigation carried out in the most scientific spirit would result in the

[1] See the exquisitely written *Souvenirs* of M. Renan: 'Il me semble souvent que j'ai au fond du cœur une ville d'Is qui sonne encore des cloches obstinées à convoquer aux offices sacrés des fidèles qui n'entendent plus,' page ii.

proof that religion is essential to morality. And we shall venture briefly to indicate the course which the discussion should take.

We should first settle carefully what the class of facts is with which we have to deal. With conduct, says Mr. Spencer, and truly. But when he proceeds to include in that term adjustments which are merely physical, he goes beyond its usual and proper application. The word refers to matters in which a practical power exists of guiding or, as we say, conducting ourselves. There are many acts of men which do not come under this class, for they are instinctive and unreasoning and admit of no choice. We may study and admire the progress of evolution which beneficently brings more and more of those acts of men which are healthful to the community into the class of involuntary movements; but this study is a study in natural history, not in ethics or in morals. The latter terms have to do with those acts alone in which choice and liberty appear; in other words, with conduct, as meaning the way in which people do or may conduct themselves. Now, whatever agencies operate in this ethical sphere must plainly produce their effect through the conscious action of the mind of man.

We should commence our investigation, therefore, not with sociology, but with a search into the facts of human consciousness. No doubt this is a method of conducting the debate which the devotees of physical science will deride as metaphysical. But in matters which have to do with the action of the mind, observation of the facts from within must take precedence of observations from without. All other creatures we are obliged to look at from without. In our own case alone have we that opportunity which we should so eagerly grasp if we could have it in any other case, of knowing how the animal itself feels and thinks. No facts of physical or social evolution can reach us in the department of morals, or produce any effect upon our minds except through our consciousness and under its conditions. And it must plainly be wrong to override facts of consciousness by any accumulation of observations upon the history of nature or man: for what are they to us but other facts of consciousness?

Now, experience of the action of consciousness which in morals we call conscience presents an element which is not to be accounted for by the past history of the communities in which we live, or by our own past history. We know that the race accumulates conceptions of the conduct on the part of individuals which is best calculated for its own preservation,

and we recognize the power which the race possesses to pass these conceptions into the nature of individuals themselves. We know how moral impulses come to us mingled with those of inherited constitution and social opinion, and education and example, and we are aware that such facts appear to Mr. Spencer sufficient to reconcile Locke and Kant, and account for the categorical imperative of duty upon purely empirical principles; we do not believe that Kant can be thus disposed of. Among all these experiences and beyond them there is a mystical power which appeals from outside the world of phenomena to a capacity which man possesses to feel its force. It is neither part of ourselves nor part of our visible environment, or of our historical inheritance. And if our consciousness is not to be believed upon this point, it cannot be believed anywhere: not even as to the facts of evolution.

It is precisely this element in the human conscience which has made the growth of morality possible. Some suppose that they point to a fact fatal to belief in supernatural morality when they show the South Sea Islander killing his aged parents, and therein justified by his conscience as completely as a European who sacrifices his own life to the call of duty. But in the conscience of the South Sea Islander there is, besides the assurance of his duty to get rid of the old and infirm, an element, vague and mysterious to him, which leaves room for future growth. He would not himself declare that social duty was completely fulfilled by his deed. He would be dimly conscious of the possibility, if not of reversal, yet of extension, of the law by the same mysterious power which imposed the particular obligation. And it is this supernatural element which gives his conscience room to expand.

Everyone can perform upon his own mind the experiments which will verify or disprove this account of our moral nature. If we be right, he will find that it is impossible to believe the experiences of conscience to be attributable to any purely phenomenal cause. And if he finds himself inevitably driven to believe that conscience would not be what it is if man were not in relation with something beyond phenomena, this will be the first step towards proving that morality is essentially religious.

The second step will consist in the perception that the mysterious influence which speaks in our sense of right and wrong, though it cannot be identified with the phenomena of our life or that of our race, yet must not, on the other hand, be relegated to any region where it shall be out of relation to our lives. For this would make impossible the very experi-

ences through which we come in contact with the mystery. If it bids us do right and reproves us when we do wrong, if it brings home to us with a sacred sanction claims of society and of individuals which else might seem to have no connexion with us whatever, this shows that the spirit, influence, or power, by whatever name we call it, which speaks in conscience, is not incapable of working in the facts of the world, though it be in itself above them. It cannot be heard except through earthly facts. It mingles with hopes and fears, with passions and desires, restraining them or enforcing them, and endowing them with a spiritual reference. And, therefore, when we would apprehend the force of this mysterious power, and bring it to bear upon our morality, we must of necessity give it a form which our thought can grasp.

Therefore it is that among all races of mankind the morality of the time has been enforced by religion. Religion has been the sanction of the morality; the embodiment of the spiritual power which man has felt to be bearing upon his moral nature. The rewards and punishments of the religion have been the attempt to make palpable and comprehensible the fact that an unknown something bids us act or abstain from acting, and gives us this command with authority. So it has been with the religions of the inferior races, who handed down from ages to ages the belief in beings who had it in their power to reward and punish man. And the same necessity of giving form to the mysterious powers on which our moral life depends asserts itself again in the unbelieving religions of modern times. Future promises and penalties, nay even rewards and punishments of any external kind, may be discarded: the consciousness of being in adjustment, or out of adjustment, with our environment may be regarded as in itself the only and the sufficient sanction of our service. But, wherever it is found necessary to worship, or even to name or to think of, under a form appreciable to our minds, the objects of our moral service, testimony is borne to the connexion between morality and religion which has ever been, and as we hold will ever be, a necessity for man.

For this reason we feel deep obligation to those unbelievers who, not content with the barren task of denying our religion, have proceeded further to recognize the moral necessity of setting up a religion in its place to fill the gap; and a still deeper obligation to those who have not only confessed this necessity in general terms, but have actually attempted to set their religion on its feet, and to give it visible embodiment and observance. We sincerely wish that side by side with the

temple of Positivist worship, which exists already in London, we could see another building set apart for the cult of the Unknowable, in which Mr. Spencer informs us the essence of religion consists, and another in which the Eternal not ourselves which makes for Righteousness might be worshipped by the disciples of Mr. Matthew Arnold. Every such attempt witnesses to the needs of human nature; and the failure which attends, and will attend, every such attempt when it is sought to set it at work, testifies that it is only in a true revelation that man can find that religion which his moral nature requires. Just because he feels himself to need it, he cannot manufacture it himself; therefore man is condemned to hopeless longing unless the Eternal has spoken to his conscience in some form which he can recognize and which exempts him from the pretence of creating.

Such a belief has been the support of morality in the past, and without this we have no reason for hoping that morality will grow or even maintain itself in the future. We do not doubt the moral power of the social system over the individual, or the growth of social morality, or the evolution of higher forms of individual life fixed and handed down by inheritance. But we say that all these powers have in the past exercised themselves in combination with religion, and the proof is wanting that they will be sufficient without it.

Let us now consider, on the other hand, the system of moral influences which evolutionists offer us. Evolution by the very force of the term implies that the account which it is capable of giving of the origin of any existing thing is incomplete. It presumes at the commencement of the course of evolution a something which is itself not the product of evolution. For, if there were not such a something at the commencement, there would be nothing to evolve; and if this something were itself evolved, we have but set back the beginning of evolution for a step. This something appears at the first as a manufactured article, endowed with or ruled by certain powers or qualities: namely, those which fit it to commence the course of evolution.

Therefore, even without special admission on the part of evolutionists, we should be entitled to point out that their system does not account for everything, but leaves a great gap at its commencement. Even if we suppose it capable of answering the question of origin for every present fact in nature or in man, by showing how it has been evolved out of a previous condition, yet at last it must come back to facts which were not evolved out of anything, and concerning

which therefore a philosopher whose only solvent is evolution must confess that he knows not whence they came. But we are not left to inference upon this matter. Evolutionists themselves have not been slow to admit that their system runs up into the unknown. They have called it the Unknowable, but we may perhaps suspect that there is an assumption in the phrase. It assumes that what is unknowable by their method is unknowable by any method, and it moreover treats that as entirely unknowable which is at the most partially so, for that cannot be wholly unknowable which we know to exist. And accordingly it is always found impossible for evolutionists to say anything whatever about this unknowable without implying knowledge in the very phrases they use.

It is admitted by evolutionists that this unknown something is not found only at the beginning of things, but also all along their course. The circle of our knowledge of the forces which keep things going now is not complete any more than our knowledge whence they came in the past. Whoever will read Chapter III. of Mr. Herbert Spencer's *First Principles* will find that every force which operates upon us at the present moment runs up, if we think of it, into the unknown. And the fact that we live thus in the midst of mystery has been known to and felt by mankind from its first existence on the earth till now.

Let us for the moment treat this experience of surrounding mystery merely as a fact universally found in human thought. It is certainly well fitted to produce a moral impression. Evolutionists seem scarcely to require us to believe that, even in the future, when science shall have taught its lessons completely, all awe and dread of the unknown shall be effectually banished, and men rest secure that the unknowable can never deal with them except by known methods, with all which methods they are well enough acquainted to relieve them of any mysterious fears. But at all events this has never been the case in the past. On what scientific principles, then, can a science of ethics which professes to found itself on history construct a moral system in which all feelings of right and wrong are supposed to be developed by the influence of social phenomena, while the sense of the unknown, though confessedly present to the consciousness of every individual throughout the course of the evolution, is wholly ignored as an agency in impressing a character upon it?

But we shall take a further step. If evolutionists cannot

upon their principles be sure that the sense of the unknown as a fact in human consciousness has had no essential part in man's moral development, neither can they be sure that no active influences have been exerted by unknown powers upon its course. That course, as we have observed, is one which not only has its origin in mystery, but holds its progress in mystery too. It is like a tree with its roots in the unknown, and growing in an atmosphere of the unknown, or like a river whose head waters flow out of mystery and which is fed by numberless streams out of mystery all along its progress.

Let us take some particular moral act in which religion appears to have an important part: for example, the death of a martyr. The martyrdom is a moral act in its nature and effects, for it exercises and strengthens that truthfulness at all costs which all will acknowledge to be socially necessary. It is also, according to the belief of the martyr himself, a religious impulse in such a sense that, if he had not believed the act to be supernaturally suggested, he would never have performed it. What is the moral history of the act according to the evolutionist?

In order to answer that question, we should have to go back very far indeed. The commencement of the history would be found in the impulses of the primitive creatures out of which the martyr was developed. The evolution of structure will proceed according to the well-known laws of selection until we are presented with men capable of pleasure and pain. These simple elements will then be shown in their action upon the individual life and upon society. The desire to avoid pain will cause the community to take pleasure in those who save it from pain. This pleasure on the part of the community will express itself in praise. The praise will be a pleasure to the recipient of it, and an encouragement to others to follow his example. The races in which the most praise is given to those who save and defend others, and in whom the largest number of persons are found to covet and attain this praise, will survive in the struggle for existence. The praise and reverence of protectors will continue even after they are dead, and will fill the imagination with supposed existences called divine, who will be considered the patrons and rewarders of self-sacrifice, and capable of exercising in perfection that power of distinguishing virtue which the community on earth exercises in its own sphere. Under those influences fixed by inheritance in the race a man is at last evolved in whom, on the one hand, the desire of pleasure has concentrated itself into the desire of self-sacrifice, while, on

the other hand, the being for whose sake the self-sacrifice is made is transformed for him from an earthly society to a divine existence. And so a martyrdom ensues.

Now, we shall suppose that the course of this development has been traced with perfect correctness within its own sphere, that all the supposed steps of progress in the physical and moral ancestry of our martyr have really taken place, and that the immediate physical causes of these changes have been rightly stated. Let us grant that the eyes and ears, the hands and limbs, of the man are what they are, because the course of natural selection has preserved the races of creatures which possessed organs capable of developing into these ; that his moral qualities have developed in the manner stated, and even that his religion has arisen by occasion of the natural fear and reverence felt for parents and tribal heads continued to them after death.

Will all this suffice to warrant the conclusion that no power beyond nature had any share in producing the moral and religious faculties which display themselves so powerfully in him, and that his own faith in his contact with a being beyond nature is untrue? Certainly not, so long as you feel yourself obliged to confess that every act and motion in the course of this immense train of development has depended upon an unknowable power. The instinctive movements of the creatures which form the earlier stages of the history; the more complicated movements of organs and nerve (even if we do not mention the words mind and soul) in the man, all equally run up into this unknowable power. We meet it, not far back in the distance, but immediately and in the present. Can you be quite sure, then, that nothing in the *character* of the man who is the product of all this wonderful past is attributable to a character possessed by the unknowable power which admittedly has contributed so much to the facts of his existence.

Doubtless it will be objected that the unknowable cannot as such possess a character, and that it would cease to be unknowable if it did. This must certainly be allowed ; but then, on the other hand, it would equally cease to be unknowable if we could know that it does not possess a character. If it be unknowable, how can you be sure what it either does or does not possess? If we put aside for the present all supposition of revelation in the usual sense of that word, the utmost that we can be expected to acknowledge will still be this : that, while we cannot be sure that anything in our moral nature is the result of corresponding moral characteristics in the un-

knowable source of the universal system out of which we are evolved, we cannot, on the other hand, be at all sure that it is not so. And this condition of belief will be found to be practically a very different thing from the agnosticism which means, not merely the confession that we know nothing about God, but the absolute conclusion that nothing can be known about Him; a conclusion which is inconsistent with itself. For you would require to know all about Him in order to be sure that He could never make Himself known. Our martyr declares himself convinced that the most reasonable account which he can give himself of his feelings and convictions, and the experiences of his life, and the facts of history as he knows them, is the faith that he is in contact with a Being whom he will not refuse to call in a certain sense unknowable, but yet who has a character and can make Himself sufficiently known for hope, fear, and love. And the agnostic will absolutely be unable to prove the belief unreasonable without assuming a knowledge of God which his very title disclaims.

But it will be urged that, even though the negative cannot be proved, it can be proved that all the feelings, convictions, and experiences upon which the martyr's conclusion rests have a natural origin, and that the believer is therefore left without any positive ground for a course which so eminently requires a strong foundation to justify it. We reply that no such analysis has ever been made of the mental phenomena which display themselves in high conditions of religion as could warrant any such assertion. Consider the rich and varied examples of religious thought and life which lie before us in the New Testament: S. Peter and S. James, S. Paul and S. John, and a greater name than any of these. The contention of the agnostic is that all the phenomena of such cases are natural. What analysis of these phenomena has ever been made which would justify such a conclusion? To be sure there have been many attempts to reduce the miraculous elements in these lives to purely natural dimensions. But, unless these attempts had been pursued so far as to show that, not only all the miraculous surroundings, but also all the inward experiences, of such minds had been produced without any true connexion with that which is behind phenomena, they are insufficient for the purposes of the agnostic. M. Renan, who holds that sometimes a smile from the Father shines over the world, introduces thereby an element into his system and into his treatment of religious history, which is as fatal to agnosticism as is the admission of the whole Christian Creed. The same may be said of the large religious move-

ments among masses of men, and indeed of the general and abiding signs of religion which display themselves in the race. Accounts of them have been given, which may be satisfactory to persons already persuaded that it must have been natural. Some of the simpler forms of religion, as displayed in very savage races, may have been satisfactorily traced to natural causes. But, even if we were to grant that in the very highest religious developments which exist, something of the outward form and clothing is due to natural tradition and development, that would fall short of scientific proof that the whole essence of the religion is similarly derived. It is agreed on all hands that the Unknowable, in making Himself known, must submit to the historical conditions and the natural developments of the race. He may have done so in a degree greater than we recognize, and yet underneath there may be something of which no other account can be given than that it is due to a real knowledge of Himself, which He imparts to the soul of man. How can agnostics tell what sufficient proofs of His reality and His action He may have communicated to the spirit of a man willing to be taught by Him? They cannot claim to give such proofs without either denying the existence of the Unknowable, or professing that He is so well known to them that they can assert Him never to have made Himself known to any man.

It may be rejoined that the reasoning which we have applied to moral actions applies also to immoral. Every act of every kind has elements which run up into the unknowable. And if we hold the martyr justified in attributing his convictions and the causes which have produced them, and the impulses which result from them, to the promptings of an unknowable power, we cannot refuse the same liberty of argument to the sensualist or the liar; he also may claim whatever sanctity may come from the mystery out of which his life and its impulses proceed. His self-gratification and selfish concealments are the result of the working of the unknown power.

It would be impossible to answer this argument if it proceeded from one who deliberately maintained the indifference of human actions and the equality of the claim which all impulses, good and bad alike, have upon our obedience. Nor can we deny that evolution morality does seem to us legitimately to involve this antinomian conclusion. Every call of duty has on this system its origin in a call of pleasure. The call of pleasure appears to the moralist to be in the course of ages much transformed, and pleasure is found as time

proceeds in that very self-denial and altruistic self-sacrifice which was originally the object of natural aversion. But if any man in his self-despair or in his love of pleasure can perform the too easy task of making himself believe that self-indulgence has not yet for him assumed its altruistic form, it does not appear what the evolution moralist can reply. He must allow that it is very hard to prescribe in individual cases the best method of adapting the organism to the environment which is possible under the circumstances. And if this best available adaptation should turn out to be the method of pleasurable indulgence, the call to it must be allowed on evolution principles to have precisely the same validity as the call to self-sacrifice which constitutes the best adaptation for other natures and in other circumstances.

However, anybody who even names the name of Ethics must have got beyond this animal estimate of our impulses. Such a one must have reached (legitimately or not) some difference in kind between one act and another; he must have come to believe that somehow in the progress of the world things come to be right or wrong. Evolution moralists profess with one voice to recognize such a progress in human things; and to anyone who differentiates act from act we can find an easy answer to the objection in question, that the sanction of the unknowable can be claimed as much for evil acts as for good. For just as the unknowable is behind each movement of a man's mind or body, so must it be behind that accumulation of movements which constitutes progress and makes ethics possible. The difference (whatever it be) between action and action which makes us give to one of them the title good and to the other that of evil comes to us with more of the influence of the unknowable in the good and less of it in the evil. So much, indeed, appears to be more than once allowed by Mr. Spencer.[1] And there is a disagreement not in kind, but only in degree, between the evolutionist who discerns more of the unknowable in what is good than in what is evil and the martyr who discerns the unknowable revealed in the life of Christ without and in the spiritual impulses of his own soul within.

We refuse, therefore, to believe that evolutionists have set

[1] 'The good and bad consequences which conduct brings round through the established order of the unknowable.'—*First Principles*, p. 117. 'If for the Divine will supposed to be supernaturally revealed we substitute the naturally revealed end towards which the power manifested in evolution works, it follows that conforming to those principles by which the highest life is achieved is furthering that end.'—*Data of Ethics*, p. 171.

before us a theory of morality and of moral progress so complete and consistent in its dependence upon phenomenal causes as to justify them in excluding religion from among the sources of morality. They do not account for the internal experience of our conscience, nor do they succeed in expelling religion from the system of influences which surround us without.

Religion supplies a gap in evolution morality which so long as it remains unfilled is quite fatal to any practical efficiency in the system. It is doubtful, as we have before hinted, whether Mr. Stephen would claim any such efficiency for his work. But at all events any rule of morals deducible from his pages is liable to the very same objection which he makes [1] to rules 'deduced from the pure reason,' whatever the precise meaning of that phrase may be. 'No moralist,' he declares, 'has succeeded in any plausible deduction of the moral code without tacitly introducing an appeal to specific facts properly irrelevant to his doctrine. If general logical rules can be deduced in this way, moral rules can only be deduced by some dexterous sleight of hand. "Ought" and "ought not" (as Hume somewhere says) are suddenly inserted in the place of "is" and "is not."'

Yet all Mr. Stephen's system, if it is to be regarded as of moral tendency at all, is but an elaborate attempt to substitute 'ought' and 'ought not' for 'is' and 'is not.' Our study of the course of evolution and of the actual relations of organism and environment yield to us nothing whatever except the knowledge of something which is or is not. How anything is to follow from it except simply a knowledge of what will be or will not be, it is impossible to show.

The evolutionist must, in our judgment, restrict his functions in ethics to the office of a looker-on. He registers the development of society, but cannot hope to influence it. One thing, at all events, is clear: that, if he expects to do the work of a practical teacher and to influence ethical progress, he above all men must appear as the propounder of a new morality. For in the constant change of relation between organism and environment morality must ever be becoming new. The past cannot, and ought not, to be the precedent for the future. The circumstances of the future will be different from those of the past, and the adjustment of our future constitution to those future circumstances ought to produce a higher degree of morality. If, then, we set about trying to exercise by our own wills any influence upon the

[1] P. 313.

course of our evolution, who shall tell us how we are to guide them? No experience in our own past and no example from any other man's life suffices to answer for us the question what may be the best adjustment which is possible under the circumstances. For neither anyone else nor we ourselves have ever had experience of an organism, or of an environment, or of a relation between the two, such as the ever-changing course of evolution will bring about in the next hour for us and much more in the next year. There is, therefore, on the evolution moral system a complete absence of specific fact to guide us. Nor can we on evolution principles commit ourselves with any confidence to the impulse of any one of our feelings or desires, whether selfish or altruistic, whether sensual or spiritual; no class of desires have in themselves any greater claim than another, and if we commit ourselves too unreservedly to any one, we may unawares be led to the neglect of some other.[1] And this would result in an adjustment less perfect than might have been obtained; which is immorality, in the sole meaning of that word which is known to the evolution system. The best thing, so far as we can observe, if the system in the form in which it is taught among us be true, would be that we should strive to reduce conscience and will to a condition of mere looking on, and so permit ourselves to drift on the stream of evolution.

For instance, let us suppose a man roused to serious reflection upon his moral state at a stage of life at which he has acquired a bad habit of drink. No doubt many social impulses would lead him to the conclusion that the moral course would be to give it up. But those social impulses have no claim, and indeed no power, to be heard except as capable of producing a pleasurable feeling in him. For, as Mr. Stephen shows, conduct is determined by feeling.[2] Balancing feeling against feeling, the drunkard may very well perceive that sobriety is for men in general the best adjustment, and even that at one period of his life sobriety would have been the best adjustment for him. But evolution has proceeded since that time, and in the present urgency of his desires and his present difficulty of resistance, and his present callousness to social feeling, may he not conclude on the most philosophical principles that the best adjustment which evolution has made possible for him is continuance to drink?

We conceive it clear, therefore, that any attempt to influence morality from the evolution standpoint must be subject

[1] P. 71. [2] P. 56.

to the full force of the objection urged by Mr. Stephen himself, that—

'so long as we remain within the limits of scientific inquiry, we must admit that the influence of the greatest moral teacher depends not upon his authority, but upon the congeniality of his teaching to the sentiments by which the social medium is already permeated.'[1]

Moreover, we must in this sentence plainly substitute the individual character for the social medium; for the social medium has no means, save through individual character, of producing moral action.

So plainly deficient, indeed, is the evolution morality in power of practical influence, that we obtain but an indecisive answer from Mr. Stephen to a question which might surely seem primary to an ethical writer—namely, this: Is it better for a man's moral progress that he should know the true theory of morality? Thus we find him stating as to the virtue of courage[2]:—

'Courage is useful; or is in other words a condition of the existence of the race. So far as the race becomes conscious of this fact, the same condition applies to this consciousness. The consciousness, that is, that courage is useful to the race, must stimulate courage. Now, it may appear that this is not a necessary result of increased intelligence. If, in fact, we suppose the intellect to become keener without any increased desire for social welfare, which is clearly possible in individual cases, the clearer perception of the social utility of courage could only stimulate it in cases where the interest of the individual was identical with that of his fellows. It might then on the average produce cowardice.'

Again[3]:—

'When I say that I know an action to be right, I may mean simply that it is in conformity with a law which, for whatever reason, I respect. . . . I admit this or that to be right—that is commanded—and on the whole, therefore, *I wish to see it done*; but I do not feel that spontaneous and instinctive sympathy which is necessary to generate æsthetic pleasure. *It is only so far as the moral law has become the law of my character, and expresses the way in which my emotions act previously to reflection upon any abstract principle, that I can be said to have a moral sense.*'

The italics are ours, and we would beg the reader in considering this extract to ask whence even the languid wish that the right thing should be done is to be obtained before the moral law has become the law of my character, or in any greater degree than that in which this has taken place. Again[4]:—

[1] P. 152. [2] P. 187. [3] P. 337. [4] P. 44.

'The admission that the moral laws are statements of essential conditions of social welfare will not even tend to make me moral if I care nothing for society.'

Again [1]:—

'I have considered what is the ground or cause of morality, what is the explanation of its existence to an independent observer; but I have not considered what is the reason consciously admitted by moral agents. The society is moral up to a certain standard "because" the society could not reach a certain stage of development without being so far moral. But this does not imply that the end of every man so far as moral is the elevation of society or the preservation of its vigour. On the contrary, it may be true that, though the moral man contributes to that end, he may never think about it.'

While, again, we find [2] a paragraph which seems to halt between blind feeling and intelligent conception of the theory of morals, as possible sources of morality:—

'The ultimate and governing principle is in all cases the utility of the quality in the sense in which utility means fitness for the conditions of life. The scientific explanation at any rate cannot get beyond an exposition of the essential implication of courage in the general conditions of social life. And this general principle may operate through an unreasoning or a reasoned instinct: that is, through the instincts of a being conscious or unconscious of their value. Now, although morality proper is only possible when reflection and a power of grasping general rules has been developed, this has still an application even to the higher stages of social growth. For a man, or even a race, may be content to accept the instinct as justifying itself, without seeking to discover its origin. And, again, a moral development may be brought about either by a reasoning or unreasoning process: either by a process of generalization and the conscious aim at some social ideal, implying an accurate perception of the conditions of life; or, on the other hand, by some "accidental" change—that is, by a change originating in other conditions than those of intellectual growth.'

This uncertainty as to the moral usefulness of moral truth is a fatal gap in evolution ethics. Religion can fill the gap. Belief in a God whose will is the guide of morality supplies that basis of 'specific fact' which Mr. Stephen desiderates in other systems, but fails to supply in his own. God's will is the specific fact which extends over all the past and stretches into the future, and binds equally and immediately the society and the individual. So far as men or communities have understood this and practised it, so far

[1] P. 340. [2] P. 189.

they have understood and practised morality, and the same will hold in the future. This will of God gives us what 'ought to be' in us, as distinguished from what actually is either in us or in any other men; at the same time it gives us what 'is' in the mind of our Father and our Judge. And thus it neither leaves moral aspiration to flicker and feel out vainly towards a future which has no fact in the past or present to guide it, nor moral sluggishness to excuse itself by the declaration that it is doing all which its circumstances require, and that no existing fact proves the necessity of advancing. It is our firm persuasion that, if religion could really be abolished and its help in the social system no longer available for an evolution which ungratefully disowns it, both these defects would display themselves with fatal power. Those desirous of moral progress would be left without any definite model and object of aspiration; and those not desirous of progress would be left without any definite reason for wishing to be better. To us Christ gives both.

When a moral system pretends, as in the present case, to be founded, not upon speculations, but upon the past history of human morality, we cannot put it to a better proof than to inquire whether it gives a natural meaning and due force to the common words by which men have expressed the aspects of moral action. Mr. Stephen affords us in one paragraph the opportunity of applying this test to him, although it must be remarked that the word 'ought,' which is the most important of all, is omitted in his list, and has nowhere been considered by him.[1]

'The moral code itself, according to the principles hitherto expounded, is briefly a statement of the conditions of social vitality. A man is said to do his *duty* when he obeys this code. He has *merit* in so far as he obeys the law; or according to some theories he has merit if he exceeds it, and demerit if he falls short of it. He is under an *obligation* again to obey the law as merit implies the fulfilment of the obligation. He is *virtuous* so far as his character secures that his conduct shall be invariably in conformity with the law; and the *conscience* is the feeling or group of feelings which make conformity pleasant, and a want of conformity painful to him. He is morally *responsible* for the duties which he is able to perform.'

The moral code is a statement of the conditions of social vitality. It is, in the evolution scheme, perfectly on a par with those physical adjustments which fit species of living creatures for victory in the struggle for existence. As the species which has the sharpest eyes and the hands best fitted

[1] P. 265.

for grasping and holding, so also the species which contains the largest number of persons willing to work for the common existence, will continue to make its existence good. Such is the rule.

Now, let us consider, in the first place, whether the great word 'duty' can retain its proper meaning under such a system. The presumption is the other way, because it is certain that the word 'duty' gathered its present meaning under a different system. It is certain that the peoples who invented and used the word hitherto did not think of what they called duty as mere obedience to the code of social vitality, but gave it a larger and a more religious reference. True, the word is sometimes narrowed down to express some restricted sphere of social service and some office performed for an earthly authority. Even in this case the word 'duty' when used with any emphasis, seems to imply the introduction, into the performance of the work, of a spirit which cannot be obtained without religion, and which would vanish with the conscious secularization of human life and motives. And when you extend the word 'duty' so as to cover the whole of life both outward and internal, and to include aspirations and strivings after higher things than have been reached before, as well as the discharge of known and ascertained services, then you must think of a motive far more spiritual than that of social vitality. Duty has ever meant, not only by its derivation, but in reality, that which is due to some one. If you cut off from all that part of life which has no visible reference to other men the belief in a spiritual being to whom inward spiritual service is due, it is impossible that the meaning of the word 'duty' should remain unimpaired. Caleb Garth, in *Middlemarch*, is a model of devotion to duty, and he is as purely secular as the authoress, Positivist as she was, could make him consistently with truth; but here is his character:—

'Caleb Garth often shook his head in meditation on the value, the indispensable might, of that myriad-headed, myriad-handed labour by which the social body is fed, clothed, and housed. It had laid hold of his imagination in boyhood. . . . All these sights of his youth had acted on him as poetry without the aid of poets, had made a philosophy of him without the aid of philosophers, a religion without the aid of theology. . . . But he had never regarded himself as otherwise than an orthodox Christian. There was no spirit of denial in Caleb.'

And when an opportunity of such social duty comes to him he declares: 'I'd sooner have it than a fortune. I hold it the most honourable work that is.' Here Caleb laid down his

etters, thrust his fingers between the buttons of his waistcoat nd sat upright, but presently proceeded with some awe in iis voice, and moving his head slowly aside—'It's a great ;ift of God, Susan.'[1] The question is whether duty will emain the same to Caleb Garth if you take away from him, iot merely his theology, but his religion and his God. We lo not believe it.

The word 'merit' comes next in Mr. Stephen's glossary. Whether merit consists in obeying the law or in going beyond he law, it certainly possesses, as used by all the world, an mplication to which our author makes no allusion, that of lesert. We think that the man of merit ought to be re-varded. He himself may not think of reward, but others hink of it for him. And, even though the man of merit does iot make reward his conscious aim, yet he longs for some :ind of noble consequence from the work which he does, and s disappointed if he must go to the grave without result from he travail of his soul. Now, if there be no religion, that is to ay, no God and no future life, there is no reward to be ex-ected beyond that which society in this world has to dis-ense; and that leaves the better and more sacred half of ioral life unrecompensed. Would mankind keep up the irce of using the word 'merit' if it had once finally lost the elief, and even the hope or guess, that this merit appealed not i vain to a rewarder? It might still say that the successful varrior or the philanthropist merited well of his country; ut of whom does the secret endeavour after inward purity ierit? to whom does it appeal for its reward if there be no iod and no religion?

Obligation implies by the form of the word a reference to ome authority which binds us. And this implication is also illy contained in the common use of the word. Now, society ndoubtedly lays us under some obligations, but they are of ery limited extent. Upon no principle known to evolution an obligation be extended to any duties which have not ecome pleasurable. That is the course and method of evolu-on. Altruistic actions do to some extent become naturally leasurable: it is a pleasure to the mother to nurse her child. ut where we cannot feel the pleasure, how shall society rove the obligation? We might reply, as people who have ttle faith in God do often reply, 'I am not obliged to do it.' eople who have faith learn that there is no virtue to which ney are not obliged. Therein lies their greater virtue. If a

[1] *Middlemarch*, chaps. xxiv., xl.

miser takes greater pleasure in hoarding than that which the praise of liberality would give him, how is he obliged to be charitable? 'You tell me,' he might say, 'that altruistic actions become pleasurable. I might, then, have been born like such a one, who delights in giving; as a matter of fact, I have not been born like him; why should I give? You only prove to me that I and he are just on a par—I in following my pleasure, he in following his.' One must recognize a moral law beyond the mere facts of human nature in order to prove men obliged to anything which they do not find in themselves; and a moral law possesses no reality whatever unless it inheres in a supernatural mind which approves and imposes it. Our obligations will shrink to narrow bounds indeed, if there is nothing to bind us beyond the actual facts of our evolution.

The virtuous man, according to Mr. Stephen, is the man whose character secures that his conduct shall be always in conformity to the law. There is probably no word so abused as the word 'law.'[1] And we must maintain that, according to the doctrines of evolution, there is no law except physical law. The whole course of the world's life hangs together in this system, an unbroken chain of necessary causation, and freewill is a delusion. Such is expressly Mr. Stephen's belief.[2] On this theory how could any man's conduct help being in conformity to the law, and how can any distinctions of virtuous or vicious be made between man and man? But if this objection against the whole claim of the evolution philosophy to the possession of a moral element were disallowed, we should still maintain that the word virtue loses its proper meaning in Mr. Stephen's explanation. For virtue is *not* in the common usage of mankind the character which secures that a man's conduct shall be in conformity to the law if that law be, as Mr. Stephen names it, the law of social vitality.

The reader will mark that the word 'vitality' is very deliberately chosen. The law which evolution recognizes as ruling is not a law of social well-being or social happiness, but solely a law of social survival.[3] 'The law of nature,' says Mr. Stephen, 'has but one precept, "Be strong." Nature has but one punishment, decay, culminating in death or extirpation, and takes cognizance of but one evil, the weakness which leads to decay.' He adds that, though from this general point of view we can make no distinction between the various in-

[1] See *Science and Faith*, by the Bishop of Carlisle, *Essay* vi.
[2] P. 278 ff. [3] P. 172.

stincts, except in so far as they imply or do not imply the vitality of the organism, yet when we regard the individual as an organism within an organism, the law takes different forms, and requires to be variously stated according to its mode of impact. According to the evolution theory, then, the original law of nature, from which all morality flows, must assume quite a different form before it passes on to the guidance of individuals. 'Be strong' is nature's only precept, and it is addressed, not to the individual, but to the species. If the individual takes it as addressed to himself, he will maintain his own strength and vitality at the expense of his species. It is better he should not think of nature's only precept at all, which is in truth not a moral precept, for, without accepting pessimism, we must deny that the mere propagation of the human race is an object which presents itself as in itself a good. Religion, we may remark, has this advantage over such a theory, that its law is homogeneous, and applies in the same form to the individual and the race.

But do we, then, really call a man virtuous because his character secures that his conduct shall be always in conformity with the law of social vitality? Certainly not. The word virtue has arisen and obtained its meaning with no reference whatever to social vitality, but in view of those forms which the law takes when it is stated for individuals. The word has even special reference to those points of character which are without reference to others, but concern a man in his secret life. It may, indeed, be that the habits called virtuous, although they have no conscious reference to social vitality, yet do in the long run tend that way. But the question is whether virtue acquired its meaning in view of this fact. For, if it did not, Mr. Stephen is not justified in assigning to the word a meaning which has reference to the law of social vitality. We hold it plain that he is not justified; and that if the evolution system, which regards the moral code merely as a statement of the conditions of social vitality, were to become recognized among men, the word virtue would fall into disuse or be obliged to change its meaning.

Conscience is, according to Mr. Stephen, the feeling or group of feelings which makes conformity to the law of vitality pleasant, and a want of conformity painful. We have on a former page attempted a partial analysis of conscience, and shown that it contains a spiritual element, of which Mr. Stephen's theory takes no account. According to him the pleasures and pains of conscience come from a precisely similar source with the pleasures of eating and the pains of hunger.

The course of evolution working upon our elementary capacities of pain and pleasure has brought it about that we have pains and pleasures of this particular kind. But what gives that supremacy to conscience on which Bishop Butler dwells? Why is it that the slightest call of conscience is felt to have a right to be listened to even in opposition to the strongest calls of sensual pleasure? And why is it that conscience, when compelling our obedience against the calls of pleasure, offers to our immediate consciousness nothing that we should call pleasure of its own? These great and well-recognized implications of the word conscience remain wholly unaccounted for by Mr. Stephen.

Lastly, Mr. Stephen shows us that a man is morally responsible for the duties he is able to perform. But to whom is he responsible? Would this word have ever come into use in ethics if the idea of a real account to be rendered had not been before the minds of men? We grant that there is an account to be rendered to society for that part of life which concerns it, and that society is so far able both to hear the cause and to assign punishment or reward. But if this be all, then we are responsible to society for those of our acts which have to do with society; while as to all that still more important part of life which remains, we are responsible to no one, and the word 'responsible' is wholly out of place.

Thus we see that, while Mr. Stephen may find a place and a meaning for all the common words which are used in morals, that place is not the place which they have hitherto taken, nor that meaning the meaning which men have attached to them in the past. Mr. Stephen's moral system is not related to the past by that bond of orderly evolution which is the sole method of advance recognized by him. It is a new creation; and while evolutionists deny this to be the method by which the ruling power of the universe proceeds, they can hardly be allowed to claim a creative force for themselves. Man's moral progress has included religion as a factor, and they have no licence from science to cast it aside.

The more deeply the ethical question is sifted, the more sure will it appear that an evidence for religion of overwhelming power lies in the facts of man's moral nature. It is not primarily an evidence for Christianity; but a great point is gained if we can get men to confess that man must have a religion. The testimony for this lies there where alone he has testimony of any truth whatever—namely, in the experiences of his own nature. That anything exists for man to hear, or see, or touch, can only be shown through the necessity

which his own feelings impose of believing in such an existence; or, at least, believing and acting as if such an existence were present. And the same proof is given by our moral experiences that the supernatural exists in relation to us. This once conceded, the moral and spiritual adaptations of Christianity to our nature and its historical facts may be trusted to define the form which the supernatural shall take for us.

ART. VII.—GWATKIN'S STUDIES OF ARIANISM.

Studies of Arianism. By H. M. GWATKIN, M.A., Lecturer and late Fellow of S. John's College, Cambridge. (Cambridge, 1882.)

IN this very scholarly and instructive work, Mr. Gwatkin emphatically reaffirms the judgment which has been passed by general Christian opinion on Arianism as a doctrinal theory, or representation of Christianity. That it 'had some attractions' he expressly admits, as everyone must do who remembers the strange revival of its energy in the days of Clarke and Waterland. Just ten years ago, the venerable Provost Hawkins, of Oriel, said to the present writer (in allusion to Milton) that he 'could not wonder at the long vitality of Arianism; for, although inconsistent, it had a good deal of attractive power, and could quote some texts, if not balanced or explained by others.' Mr. Gwatkin says (p. 2.): 'It seemed simpler than orthodoxy, and was more symmetrical than Semiarianism, more human than Sabellianism, while to the heathen it was very Christian-sounding.' It may be added that, like other heresies, it made pretences to reverence.[1] But it was alike unsatisfactory to faith and to reason, at once illogical and indevout. Its conception of the Son of God was not only offensive to the traditions and instincts of Christian worship and spiritual loyalty, but fatally flawed by what is best described by the striking words of Dr. Mozley, in his *Essay on the Theory of Development*:—

'The position . . . supposed a being who was not to be supposed; a being who demanded worship on account of his greatness, and could not receive it on account of his creatureship, . . . a being, virtually a god to human minds, and yet an idol the instant he was a god.'

[1] S. Athan. *Orat. c. Arian.* i. 28.

In the eyes of the Fathers

'the Arian Demiurgus was a theological monster, unlawfully, profanely, and falsely imagined. It was a principle with them to dislike proximities to Deity. They feared and suspected, as such, ambiguities and borderings in this department. . . . Let creatures be creatures, and let God be God, their theology said; the halfway and mixed being, who was a god to the imagination and not to the reason, the nature which trembled on the verge of godhead, just "all but" Divine, and yet not Divine, were not legitimate existences in their eyes. They dreaded the confusion which vicinity caused; the shading-off of the keen distinction between what was God and what was not; the dilution of the idea of Deity' (p. 78).

Here is the point: Arianism was retrogressive, because, whereas Christianity had taken its stand firmly on the idea of a single, unique, incommunicable Deity, between which and the loftiest Archangelical existence there was a gulf literally immeasurable, in that the One Sovereign Being who 'could not give His glory to another' could by His mere fiat sweep back into nothingness all the creatures that He had called out of it,[1] Arianism went far to obliterate this distinction by its theory of a 'god' who 'once did not exist,' and thus exposed itself to the charge of Paganizing which Athanasius repeatedly brings against its advocates; *e.g.* (to quote one passage), 'If these men say that the Lord is a creature, and worship Him as a creature, how do they differ from the Heathen?'[2]

It is this injury done by Arianism to a pure and exact Theism which justifies Kingsley in calling it

'the last and, as it were, apologetic refuge of dying Polytheism,' so that 'it, and not the Catholic faith, denied the abysmal unity of the Godhead, . . . the absoluteness, the infinity, the illimitability by any category of quantity, of that One Eternal, of whom it is written, that God is a Spirit.'[3]

[1] The reader will perhaps remember the tremendous question put by the Roman Catholic Dr. Hawarden to the Arian Dr. Clarke in the presence of Queen Caroline. Hawarden had listened attentively to Clarke's exposition of Arianism, and had said in effect, 'I think I apprehend you rightly; but I shall only reply by asking a single question. If it seems at all ambiguous, let it be cleared of ambiguity before it is answered. But I desire that the answer, when it comes, may be given either by the affirmative or negative monosyllable.' Clarke agreed; and then his opponent said, 'Then I ask, *Can God the Father annihilate the Son and the Holy Ghost?* Answer me—yes or no!' There was a deep silence. At last Clarke helplessly said, 'It is a question which I have never considered.' The discussion ended there. (Waterland's *Works*, ed. Van Mildert, i. 78.)

[2] *Ep. ad Ep. Æg.* 13.

[3] *The Roman and the Teuton*, p. 68.

Thus Mr. Gwatkin, repeatedly:—

'As a system, Arianism was utterly illogical and unspiritual, a clear step back to heathenism, and a plain anachronism even for its own time. It began by attempting to establish Christian positions, and ended by subverting each and all of them. It maintained the unity of God by opening the door to polytheism. It upheld the Lord's divinity by making the Son of God a creature, and then worshipped Him to escape the reproach of heathenism. . . . In a word, there could be no intrinsic strength in a system which covered the whole field of Christian doctrine with the ruin of its pretentious failures' (p. 2).

Again:—

'The Lord's deity had been denied often enough before, and so had His humanity; but it was reserved for Arianism at once to affirm and to nullify them both. The doctrine is heathen to the core; for the Arian Christ is nothing but a heathen demigod' (p. 27).

Again:—

'Arius proclaims a God of mystery beyond the knowledge of the Son Himself, yet argues throughout as if human relations could exhaust the significance of the divine. . . . . In his irreverent hands the Lord is . . . the minister of the first creation and the prophet of the second, but the Lord of life is neither. . . . Far from spanning the infinite abyss which philosophy, not revelation, had placed between God and sinless man, the Arian Christ is nothing but an isolated pillar in its midst. . . . No false system ever struck more directly at the life of Christianity than Arianism. Yet, after all, it held aloft the Lord's example as the Son of Man, and never wavered in its worship of Him as the Son of God. On its own principles, this was absolutely heathen creature-worship' (pp. 27, 28).

Again, with a touch of exaggeration:—

'Arianism . . . was nothing else than philosophic heathenism inside the Church' (p. 199).

Again:—

'The Arians impartially abolished both the Lord's two natures' (*i.e.* His real Godhead and His complete manhood) 'and left an idolatrous abomination in their place' (p. 20).

Again, near the end of the book:—

'Arianism was an illogical compromise. It went too far for heathenism, not far enough for Christianity. It conceded Christian worship to the Lord, though it made Him no better than a heathen demigod' (Mr. Gwatkin is peculiarly fond of this phrase). 'On one side their' (the Arians') 'doctrine was a mass of presumptuous theorizing, supported by alternate scraps of obsolete traditionalism and

[illegible] a [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

Again Mr Gwatkin pays [illegible] homage to the great champion of the Nicene faith. He brings out indeed the fact that he mistook the intention of the title of *Logos* affixed by Arius to the metrical exposition of his doctrine, for its real meaning was a *spiritual* banquet (see p. 30): and also the occasional formalities of language into which the bitterness of exile betrayed that princely spirit (p. 133).

He also points out a few curious mistakes on points of exegesis and trial into which Athanasius fell (p. 69), and admits that he may have listened too easily to the stories told him of Arian misdeeds (p. 70). But he dwells with cordial earnestness not only on his intense *Scripturalism* (a point which Mr. Kesie had noticed in the appendix to his Sermon on Tradition), but on his 'spirit of comprehensive charity' (pp. 44, 163). There is one passage which we cannot forbear to quote. It refers to the great Archbishop's readiness to meet the Semiarian leaders halfway, when they seemed to be rising to a higher level in 359:—

'The Eastern Church has no more honoured name than that of Athanasius; yet even Athanasius rises above himself in his *De Synodis*. He had been a champion of controversy from his youth, and spent his manhood in the forefront of its hottest battle. The care of many churches rested upon him: the pertinacity of many enemies wore out his life. Twice he had been driven from his see, and twice come back in triumph; and now, far on in life, he saw his work again destroyed, himself once more a fugitive. We . . . cannot wonder if even Athanasius grows more and more bitter and unjust to the authors of his exile. Yet no sooner is he cheered with the rays of hope than the importunate jealousies of forty years' (?) 'are hushed in a moment, as though the Lord had spoken peace to the tumult of the grey old exile's troubled soul. To the impenitent Arians he is the same as ever; but for old enemies returning to a better mind he has nothing but brotherly consideration and respectful sympathy' (p. 176).

So of his moral reign over Egypt during his third exile:—

'The great archbishop was never greater than when he seemed alone in defence of the great council' (p. 154).

So, again, of Athanasius as a controversialist:—

'His whole spirit seems penetrated by his vivid faith in the reality and eternal meaning of the Incarnation. . . . Throughout his long career we catch glimpses of a spiritual depth which few of his contemporaries could reach' (p. 70).

This last clause may be compared with a note in Mr. R. W. Dale's valuable *Lectures on the Atonement* (lect. vii.):—

'Some of the profoundest hints of the true direction in which to look for a theory of the Atonement occur in his (Athanasius's) *Four Discourses against the Arians.* . . . The common impression of him' (Mr. Dale adds) 'in England among those who are not adherents of the "Catholic" party—Roman or Anglican—is extremely unjust.'

Once more, as to Athanasius's acceptance of the profession of faith from 'the old companion of his exile,' the much-suspected Marcellus, then (in 371) 'living in extreme old age at Ancyra':—

'Even the great Alexandrian's comprehensive charity is hardly nobler than his faithfulness to erring friends. Meaner men might cherish the petty jealousies of controversy; but the veterans of the great council once more recognized their fellowship in Christ' (p. 247).

Such statements as the above are all the more impressive because their author is a zealous and accomplished disciple of the modern Cambridge school, which not the most recklessly anti-Christian critic could charge with holding a brief for 'stereotyped dogmas,' for 'ecclesiasticism,' or for 'sacerdotalism.' The school has done great things for sacred literature, and taught important lessons to Christian students; and if any bias is ever observable in its language, this would be rather in the direction of a suspicion of what our American brethren call the 'churchly' spirit, as if it involved narrowness or bigotry. Mr. Gwatkin, for instance, thinks well to utter warnings against the temptation to 'make nature and history give place to dogma,' and on the theologian's duty of learning, if need be, from men of science, 'the scientific spirit of patient reverence and wary independence,' 'of receiving truth from whatever quarter it may come,' &c. (p. 265). His way of speaking of Councils and Fathers is curiously unlike the old traditional Anglican manner, such as one finds it, for instance, in those too scanty writings bequeathed to us by that truly great Cambridge theologian of a past generation, the late Professor Mill. All the more significant, therefore, as coming from so 'independent' a quarter, is Mr. Gwatkin's suggestion that the 'Chalcedonian doctrine' of the union of

two natures in our Lord's one Person is in 'true analogy to the constitution of nature,' and 'seems to point to a universal law which rules at every meeting-point of earth and heaven, of matter and the spirit-world' (p. xvi).

The thought is rather hinted than expounded; it comes before us immersed in somewhat of that mysticism which, to our minds, is a drawback to Dr. Westcott's style, and which is never found in that of Bishop Lightfoot. And there is a little oversight in the reference to Hooker as 'summing up the work of the Council of Chalcedon in the memorable formula, *ἀληθῶς, τελέως, ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀσυγχύτως.*' Although the Chalcedonian definition contains the three adverbs, *ἀληθῶς, ἀσυγχύτως, ἀδιαιρέτως*, yet Hooker uses the four as representing respectively the doctrinal conclusions of the first four General Councils, not of the fourth alone.

Mr. Gwatkin does not seem to appreciate a work which Dean Stanley also not unnaturally disparaged, but which to us appears to be one of the great productions of a wonderful mind:—

'Of Newman's *Arians of the Fourth Century* let it suffice to say that his theories have always been scrupulously examined, so that if they have not often been accepted, it is only because there is usually good reason for rejecting them' (p. xix).

He is alluding to what he calls a 'wild theory' as to an Antiochene school of Quartodecimanism, and to the more important theory of a historical connection between the Antiochene habit of thought and the Arian heresy: a theory which, as the *Apologia* shows us, was originally related to an old enthusiasm for the Alexandrian school. Mr. Gwatkin, on the other hand, adduces the Alexandrian subordinationism, the early popularity of Arius, as parish priest of Baucalis, at Alexandria, the decided anti-Arianism of Eustathius of Antioch. By all means let these considerations have due weight, although Cardinal Newman in 1871 appended to the third edition of the *Arians* a long quotation from his *Essay on Development*, in support of the theory that Arianism was but one out of various errors traceable to one and the same mode of theologizing, and that mode, as well as the errors it originated, the characteristic of the Syrian school; but, taking broader ground, and admitting that later inquiry has corrected a few of Newman's statements on minor points[1] (*e.g.* on such a matter as the date of 347 for the Sardican Council),

[1] But in 1843 Dr. Newman adopted the date of 344 (*Hist. Tracts of S. Athanasius*, p. xiv ff.)

we must needs say that Mr. Gwatkin might have learned much more from the *Arians of the Fourth Century*, if he had been more truly in sympathy with its interior spirit. It is no discredit to him that his work is inferior to that of a supreme master of English in grace of composition and concentrated force of statement; that, for instance, it contains nothing like the fervid vindication of Origen from the charge of anticipated Arianism in *Arians* (p. 99 ff.), or the bold recognition of a 'dispensation of natural religion or Paganism, running side by side with the patriarchal'[1] (*ib.* p. 83); or the luminous exposition of the necessary upgrowth of theological formulas (however imperfect they may and must be considered as representations of infinite truths), and of their positively beneficial effect in 'assisting the acts of religious worship and obedience' (p. 148 ff.); or the summary of the position of the Semiarians as distinct from the original Eusebians (p. 304 ff.); or the explanation of the superficial attractiveness of the 'Homoion' as 'shutting up the subject in Scripture terms,' and thus 'seeming to be a peaceful doctrine' (p. 317); or the accounts of the lapse of the aged Hosius under brutal treatment (p. 332), or of the adventurous career of Aetius, who is not simply denounced as an offensive Anomœan, but presented to us as 'a remarkable instance of the struggles and success of a restless and aspiring mind under the pressure of difficulties' (p. 347); or of the memorable enthronization-sermon of Meletius in the 'Golden Church' of Antioch (p. 375): or, again, that it falls below the high level of the *Arians* in theological depth, keenness, and richness, such as appear so wonderfully in Newman's sections on the 'Scriptural' and the 'ecclesiastical' doctrine of the Trinity, and on 'variations of ante-Nicene theological statements':— but besides this it seems to us that, while Mr. Gwatkin (as our quotations have shown, and as appears from other passages which we have not quoted) has a very real sense of the religious importance of the question, he would hardly assimilate the peculiar combination of awe and tenderness which appears so characteristically in such a passage as the following:—

'More than enough has now been said in explanation of a controversy the very sound of which must be painful to anyone who has a loving faith in the Divinity of the Son. Yet so it has been ordered, that He who was once lifted up to the gaze of the world, and hid not His face from contumely, has again been subjected to rude scrutiny and dishonour in the promulgation of His religion to

[1] On this see Newman's *Apologia*, p. 88.

the world. And His true followers have been themselves obliged in His defence to raise and fix their eyes boldly on Him, as if He were one of themselves, dismissing the natural reverence which would keep them ever at His feet' (*Arians*, p. 225).

How characteristic are these words! how well we know the thrill of their solemn music! how they illustrate what was said in the *Christian Remembrancer* for July 1864, of one who 'at favoured moments half lifted the veil of the unseen, making heaven and heavenly ministers something more than objects of faith, and investing them with new and entrancing certainty; who made life feel a more august thing in contact with him,' so that 'men' were fain to 'bow' as 'in a superior presence, and say, "This is the stuff that saints are made of."' Nothing could be more pitiable than for a person to adopt such a tone as breathes through the above extract, unless it were natural to him. Let every one speak and write as he feels, and so be true to himself. Still this tone, where it exists, does give to book or speech a special and indescribable charm, which is lacking where it does not exist. And probably a strong infusion of this peculiar *αἰδώς*, with its deepening, restraining, and solemnizing influence, would have kept the style of the volume before us free from a tendency now to off-hand peremptoriness, now to jerky smartness, and now to grandiose declamation. Here and there, too, as at pp. 55, 72, one finds notes which are not properly worked into construction. The terms 'Homœan' and 'Anomœan' are mentioned before they are explained (p. 61 ff.). Two or three critical moments in Athanasius's life, which might well enkindle a less sympathetic writer than Mr. Gwatkin, are treated in a strangely spiritless fashion: while 'the remoter consequences of the flight of Athanasius' are rhetorically described as to be 'sought at the mosque of Omar and among the ruins of Alexandria,' inasmuch as the native Egyptians were being alienated from the empire (p. 155), and pages are spent on various matters which have but a very remote connection with the professed subject of the volume. Sometimes there is, indeed, good round abuse of the persecutors of Christianity, as at p. 107—

'the years of shame and outrage when the Evil Beast ran riot in the slaughter of the saints of God, and *every whelp of Satan* drank his fill of Christian blood.'

This is a flash from those *bizarre* fireworks which blaze at intervals through Mr. Mason's *Diocletian Persecution*, otherwise a charming book, an acquaintance with which is here

clearly pre-supposed on the part of Mr. Gwatkin's readers. One does not see why the story (rightly rejected) of Athanasius having been first seen by Alexander when as a boy he was going through the form of baptizing his playfellows should repeatedly be called his 'boy-baptism.' It is hardly dignified to begin a sentence with 'Firebrand Lucifer' (p. 205), or to nickname Constantius, twice within two pages, 'his holiness' (pp. 152, 153). Some of Mr. Gwatkin's biographical parallels appear due to an impulsive love of point. If Constantius was, as he was, a theological pedant, his 'coldness' or 'callousness' was not quite of the same kind with that of Louis XV. (p. 60). Mr. Gwatkin probably did not imagine that any reader would be offended by such a comparison as 'the peculiar repulsiveness of Constantius, *like that of Charles I.*' (p. 110), or that between the position of the Nicene cause in 356 and that of the French republic after 1873. What follows is too like the obscurely allusive passages which sometimes disfigure a clever prize-essay.

'Three groups of conspirators agreed to profane the honourable name of conservatism, but could agree in nothing else. . . . As with the French republic, it might have been foreseen that the prize would fall to the genuine conservatives. The danger to the Nicene side was not in the mere tyranny of the court, which only worked against its authors, but in the excesses of *irreconcilables* like Marcellus or Lucifer, which gave a colour of truth to the systematic slanders spread by the moral order adventurers in power' (p. 156).

This use of the word 'conservative' is quite a feature of Mr. Gwatkin's book. He applies it (1) to those who, while really owning our Lord's Divinity, were averse to the original introduction of the Homoousion into the creed of the Church, and afterwards (2) to the Semiarian party (see p. 38). Thus we hear of 'conservative feeling' as gratified by a 'prudent evasion of the question;' of 'a conservative confession which commanded the assent of all parties by deciding nothing;' of a 'conservative panic, undignified from the first;' of Marcellus as 'alarming the whole conservative party;' of 'the conservative coalition'; of 'Pontus being devoted to conservatism,' &c. &c. 'Conservatism' occurs thrice in p. 53, 'conservative' six times there, six times in p. 167. In short, the phrase is produced *ad nauseam*: and, besides the drawback of its secular associations, we submit that for the most part it suggests an incorrect idea. Even in the early days of the controversy, Alexander and others claimed to be the true maintainers of the Church's inherited belief; and after the Nicene Council, it was surely the adherents of its creed who

might most legitimately pass for 'conservatives.' Again, whereas in p. 129 we are told that 'Nicenes and conservatives were fundamentally agreed upon the reality of our Lord's Divinity,' 'the Arian evasion of John x. 30 as a mere reference to unity of will' is called 'the usual conservative explanation' of that text (p. 118); and in p. 38 the arch-'conservative' Eusebius of Cæsarea is described as not allowing to the Son full eternity.[1] We are not going to discuss the question of his orthodoxy; but we observe in the note (p. 38) referring to the passage which defines his position as 'conservative,' that the idea of 'hypostatic distinctions,' presumably in the Trinity, is described as 'the new idea which at that time claimed admittance.' So in an earlier passage: 'in the fourth century it became clear that the problem required a distinction to be made within the Divine Unity' (p. 8). We cannot suppose our author to mean that, before the Arian controversy arose, there was no belief in a real Trinity; that the Church did not hold—albeit without the term Homoousion—that the Son was in a true sense distinct from the Father, and yet was mysteriously one with Him as God,—in other words, that (1) the primordial dogma, 'There is One God,' was in some mysterious way consistent with both the two specifically Christian dogmas, (2) 'There is a Son of God,' and (3) 'The Son is Himself God.'[2] Two opposite tendencies of heterodox thought in the ante-Nicene times aimed in effect at maintaining the Divine Unity at the sacrifice of one or other of the two other positions. On one side, the Sonship was explained away by a school which would fain secure our Lord's Divinity, and harmonize it with the Divine Oneness at the cost of His personality. On the other side, His personality as Son was emphasized, as forbidding, in the interest of the Unity, His inclusion within the incommunicable majesty of the One God. The Church agreed with both these schools in affirming Monotheism, or the 'Monarchia,' in the older sense of that phrase;[3] she differed from them in that she taught that both the second and third dogmas were

[1] Eusebius is also said to have held 'that the Trinity is from the will only of God. Compare p. 24: 'There is no guarantee for the permanence of the Trinity, unless it expresses the Divine Nature.'

[2] 'The Offspring of God is God,' S. Irenæus, i. 8. 5. Compare Newman's *Sermons*, vi. 57, 'He is God, not *though*, but *because* He is the Son of God.'

[3] See Cardinal Newman's *Select Treatises of S. Athanasius*, i. 45, ed. 1; ii. 110 ff. ed. 2. He shows how this term, signifying at first the Divine Unity, came to mean 'the doctrine that the Second and Third Persons in the Everblessed Trinity are ever to be referred in our thoughts to the First as the Fountain of Godhead.'

parts of her deposit, and must be held together with the primal truth of the Israelitic creed. Thus she 'worshipped one God,' but Him as existing 'in Trinity.' And since she treated both the erroneous forms of Monarchianism as heretical, she did in truth, with whatever simplicity of language, acknowledge a personal distinction within the Divine Unity; and the idea of 'hypostatic distinctions,' if we look at it in its root and substance, was *not* 'new' when Arianism arose to trouble her peace.[1] If it had been really new, what would be the inference as to her faith? We would refer to an important context in the 'scope and method' of 'the dogmatic office' in Dr. Mozley's posthumously published *Lectures*. He warns us against the 'fundamental mistake of confounding words with things, and imagining you have got a new truth every time you have got a new term.' These defences (in the form of theological definitions) 'are necessary to guard the original truth, as ramparts to guard a city; but the ramparts are not the city, nor are these terminological structures truth's substance,'[2] &c. He had said long before, 'I' (as a modern Christian) 'have only more expressions than the early Christian had; and he had quite as full and rich a substance, because the selfsame one;' and again, in a passage which bears directly on our present point:—

'The Nicene Creed only asserted and guarded a truth which had been held from the first, *viz.* that of Christ's true and proper Divinity. The original Christian revelation declared that Christ was God. If Christ was God, He was true God; He had true and proper Godhead. The Nicene Creed asserted this of Him, and no more . . . . by the word Homoousion. The word Homoousion declared that Christ was very God with God the Father. . . . Should it be said that the word "God" . . . . might mean secondary as well as true Godhead, let it be well observed to whom the Christian revelation was given. The Christian revelation was not engrafted on Paganism, which had not the belief, but on Judaism, which had the belief in the unity of the Divine Nature. "Hear, O Israel,' was the Law's voice; "the Lord thy God is *one* Lord.'

And further, if the theory of a positive growth of the substance of Christian belief had been suggested by any one to the Nicene Fathers, they . . .

[1] See Mahan's *Church History*, p. 173. Whenever the 'limits' of the doctrines of the Divine Unity, and of the Divinity and Personality of the Son, 'were transcended by any teacher . . . when, in other words, either the proper divinity or the distinct personality of the Son of God was denied, then the churchly and orthodox instinct made itself felt.'

[2] Mozley's *Lectures and other Papers*, p. 89.

'would have been utterly astonished at his audacity; and they would have told him to communicate his assistance to heretics, for that they wanted none of it. . . . They said, This is the old doctrine that we have, . . . which we received from our predecessors as they received it from theirs, and which we now maintain as they maintained it. The same, the very same, they repeated. . . . They would not listen to any other, for the simple reason that that other was not the same. "Who ever heard of such things?" was the universal cry of the orthodox on Arianism appearing'[1] (see, *e.g.* the Encyclical of Alexander, in Soc. i. 6, or Athanasius, *Orat. c. Arian.* i. 8).

Mr. Gwatkin, we think, was led away by the charm of an antithesis when he said that 'the victors of Nicæa leaned on Scripture, the Arians on tradition, throughout the controversy' (p. 43). In the remainder of his context he modifies the impression then given, and elsewhere (p. 256) calls Arianism 'a thing of yesterday.' While it is impossible to overstate the confidence with which Athanasius, for one, appealed to Scripture, it is right to insist also on the emphasis with which he and his friends proclaimed that *they* were the true conservators of the traditional faith of the Church.[2]

We turn to other points. Perhaps it is the very warmth of Mr. Gwatkin's admiration for S. Athanasius that indisposes him to believe that the hero of the Church could have been in any sense a promoter of monasticism. In the index we are boldly told that he '*never mentions Antony*, 99.' At p. 99 what we find is, that the mention of 'Father Antony' in *Hist. Ari.* 14 is dependent on the *Vita* [*Antonii*], c. 86, and *scarcely consistent with facts*.' This seems to be a hint that the passage is an insertion, taken from the *Life of Antony*, which, Mr. Gwatkin contends, is (not merely, as some might think, interpolated, or written under Athanasius' supervision, but) absolutely spurious, although 'in substance written, and perhaps at Alexandria, and even translated, before 375,' *i.e.* before Athanasius had been dead two years, and ascribed 'to Athanasius by Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* 21, written soon after 380. But this seems copied from the work itself. It is anonymous to Augustine in 385, . . . and to Jerome in 375–6,' &c. The second reference is to the *Confessions*, viii. 6. Augustine is telling how Pontitianus, in 386, said that, some time before, he and three others had met with 'a little book containing the life of Antony' in a cottage occupied by some ascetics outside the walls of Treves. Jerome, at the opening of his *Life of Paul*, just alludes to the life of

[1] Mozley, *The Theory of Development*, pp. 159, 163–66.
[2] See too Athan. *Orat. c. Ari.* iii. 28.

Antony as having been 'written both with a Greek and a Roman pen.' 'About the allusions of Ephrem Syrus,' says Mr. Gwatkin, 'I can find nothing certain; but even Tillemont, viii. 138' (qu. 228) 'seems doubtful of them.' Does he? He just says, 'On ajoute encore le témoignage,' &c. And Ephrem not only, in his letter to John the monk, supposes the received account of Antony's asceticism to be well known,[1] but in the tenth chapter of his treatise 'In illud, Attende tibi ipsi,' says, 'Such was the character of the holy Antony, even as also the holy archbishop Athanasius mentions in the life which he wrote of him,' and he gives the sense of part of *Vit. Anton.*[2] Ephrem died in the same year as Athanasius.

But, pass the question of the authorship: is it credible that 'S. Antony' is simply a monastic ideal? To this extent of scepticism we cannot follow Mr. Gwatkin. There was not time for such a myth to form before, say, 370. Mr. Gwatkin sets aside Jerome's statement in *Epist.* 127 as 'very confused.' Let us look at it. Jerome (A.D. 412) is saying that when Marcella became an ascetic, no other Roman lady had 'known the purpose of monks, nor had ventured to assume a name' (the monastic) 'which was then thought ignominious and despicable. *She* had learned about the life of blessed Antony, who was then still living, and the discipline of the monasteries in the Thebaid, of Pachumius' (*sic*), 'and of virgins and widows, from the bishops of Alexandria, both Pope Athanasius and afterwards Peter, who . . . . had fled to Rome.' The long interval between Athanasius's visit to Rome and Marcella's death (after 410) leads Mr. Gwatkin to say, in his summary fashion, that Jerome 'is plainly romancing when he introduces her name;' but it had been noticed by a very different writer, who suggests that Jerome's words need not be taken to mean more than that 'S. Athanasius having made known at Rome the monastic life, S. Marcella loved it as soon as she was old enough to understand it, and was the first to embrace it, but long afterwards, perhaps when Peter came to Rome in 373 or 374, and renewed the instruction previously given by S. Athanasius.'[3] Mr. Gwatkin's argument from Athanasius's own words, 'Having laid my affairs before the Roman Church—for this was the one thing about which I was solicitous—I spent my leisure in the public services,' does surprise us. Athanasius staid at Rome, as he himself tells us, three years and more. Did he talk to no one all

[1] *Op.* ii. 189, ed. 1743. [2] *Op.* i. 249. [3] Tillemont, xii. 631.

that time, after he had once stated his case to Julius? And if he did talk, would not any Egyptian forms of Christian asceticism be natural topics, especially when his companion, the monk Ammonius, who had no eye for any building in Rome save the basilica of the Apostles, would be sure to attract attention?[1] It is not contended that Athanasius founded any monastic community at Rome. When Mr. Gwatkin says that, in his 'Festal Letter' for 338, Athanasius 'mentions no monks,' we would refer him to the translation of the 'Festal Letters' in the *Library of the Fathers*, p. 71, where there is a paragraph in which monks are expressly mentioned, and the note says that 'in the Syriac text, as published by Mr. Cureton, as well as in the German translation, . . . two or three pages' are 'wanting,' but 'two more leaves were afterwards discovered among the fragments in the British Museum,' and in one of them the passage occurs. Again, when Mr. Gwatkin has to face Athanasius's letter to Dracontius, he says that 'the context shows' that the monks spoken of in chap. 9 'were ascetics of the old type, who refrained neither from marriage nor from social life.' But when Athanasius says, 'Many of the bishops *have never married*, while monks *have been fathers* of children,' he must be understood as referring to marriage before ordination and parentage before the adoption of monastic life. For it was an old rule of the Church that neither bishops nor priests should marry after ordination.[2] In the other sentences of this chapter he speaks, it is true, of present practice, intimating that some monks did not abstain from meat or wine. But in an earlier passage (chap. 7) he shows clearly that he is thinking of monks as living apart from ordinary society. 'You are not the only one who has presided over a monastery before he became a bishop;' Serapion and others did so.

Unfortunately Mr. Gwatkin's horror of monasticism betrays him at p. 230 into a parallelism at once sensational and unfair. He calls the monks of Julian's time 'the successors of Marcion and Montanus;' and not content with this, he virtually takes Tertullian, in one of his coarsest Montanist moods, as a representative of the feeling of the Catholic ascetics whom Basil, at any rate, if not Athanasius, patronized. This is not history; it is not justice. Let us rather go for history and justice to the illustrious Cambridge Doctor, 'the very dust of whose writings is gold.' Preaching *ad clerum* on 1 Tim. iv. 1, he says:—

[1] Soc. iv. 23.

[2] Soc. i. 11.

'Hæc ad monachos, et quidem veteres trahere . . . ad eos restringere qui ipsi tantum a nuptiis abstinebant, in aliis nunquam damnabant, qui tantummodo virginitatem matrimonio, cum apostolo, præferebant, nuptias nunquam fornicationem vocabant . . . . ab omni ratione abhorrere arbitror.'[1]

These are not the only cases in which Mr. Gwatkin seems hardly equitable. While he is kindly in his estimate of Constans, and gives Theodosius credit for not really wishing to persecute Macedonians, he slurs over the significant heathen evidence for the *positive* tolerance of Jovian.[2] Let this short-lived 'royal soldier,' who recalled Athanasius from his fourth exile, bluntly expressed his disgust at the Arian agitators, and avowed himself a hearty Catholic, yet granted religious freedom on all hands, have at least what praise is fairly his due. Unhappily, he was stained by sensual vices; but the heathen historian's brief and 'mild censure' hardly warrants the tone of moral indignation in which Mr. Gwatkin demands whether 'fornication and all other deadly sin is a light matter in the eyes of a Christian bishop,' who had said that Jovian's 'vices were of such a kind that, according to Ammianus (who was not prepossessed in his favour), he would probably have corrected them when in the responsible station of emperor. Allowances were also to be made for his profession and his youth. He was not much more than thirty-one years old when he succeeded Julian, and the Roman camp was not a school of moral virtues.'[3] We do not see, for our parts, that the Bishop of Lincoln deserves such a rebuke at the hands of Mr. Gwatkin. And is it worse to make 'allowance' for age and circumstances in one whom Mr. Gwatkin himself presumes to have been unbaptized, than to infer 'all' the deadly sins from the mention of two?

Again, we regret to observe the coldness with which our author regards S. Basil. He grants that 'the very pride with which his enemies reproached him was often no more than a strong man's consciousness of power' (p. 244). But still he represents him on the whole as a proud imperious prelate, an ascetic who, if 'too much in earnest to feign sympathy,' was 'too full of his own purposes to feel it.' Was it so, indeed? Turn to his own letters: they repeatedly illustrate that saying of the Apostle as to the relation between affliction and the power of administering comfort. Out of the deep well of his own sorrows, especially perhaps of the distress produced by

[1] Pearson, *Minor Works*, ii. 52. [2] Soc. iii. 29.
[3] Bishop Wordsworth's *Church History*, ii. 195.

an indomitable enmity which struck at him with the most varied slanders,[1] and amid perpetual attacks of exhausting and painful illness, which would have driven some natures back into themselves, there springs up a marvellous readiness and tenderness of sympathy which can identify itself with any form of trouble—the miseries of a province, or the religious anxieties of a pious widow, or the difficulties of a conscientious soldier, or an old man plunged into poverty, or a father bereft of a youthful son, or peasants compelled to swear to pay their taxes, or a priest whose stock of corn has been carried off, or ejected Catholic ecclesiastics, or monks whose buildings have been burned in an Arian raid; be the trial what it may, the sorely-burdened primate of Cappadocia, who often seemed so stately and distant, can throw his heart into it at once, and administer the appropriate consolation. 'Submit to the Father's discipline; play the athlete with the crown close in view; in all things we should adore the Divine benignity, and say, The Lord gave, the Lord hath taken away, blessed be the name of the Lord!' Such was he at whose memory Mr. Gwatkin levels this curt epigram: 'Basil had sufficient worldly prudence to dissemble his belief in the Holy Spirit' (p. 245).

A word or two on that matter, for mere justice' sake. A monk had said, in Gregory Nazianzen's hearing, that 'Basil had omitted, with more policy than true religion, to call the Holy Spirit *God*.'[2] Gregory explained, in effect, that Basil had thought it was better to disarm, so far, attacks on himself, and through him on 'the truth,' by applying to the Third Person of the Holy Trinity phrases implying rather than asserting His Godhead. This might be a mistake on Basil's part, but it was not prompted by '*worldly* prudence,' and it was not a faithless suppression of convictions; and the mistrust or dissatisfaction which it caused was corrected by no less a person than S. Athanasius himself, in letters still extant, which express surprise at 'the rashness of those who dared to speak against that true servant of God, Bishop Basil,' whose 'purity of conscience ought to be appreciated,' and explain that in this matter he had 'become weak to the weak, that he might gain the weak,' by a 'condescension' (*οἰκονομίαν*).[3] The curious point in the case is that, in an earlier passage, Mr. Gwatkin had said simply, 'He was blamed by the stricter Nicenes for his *οἰκονομία* in avoiding any open attack upon them'—the Macedonians (p. 233).

[1] See *e.g.* S. Bas. *Epist.* 71, 119, 189, 251.
[2] S. Greg. Naz. *Epist.* 58. [3] S. Ath. *ad Joan. et Ant., ad Pallad.*

We may here observe that one of his minor troubles was caused by his 'Chorepiscopi.' There were fifty of them, it seems, within his own diocese. Their duty was to receive from presbyters and deacons a report as to persons fit for lower clerical office, to give notice of it to the bishop, and then to appoint the new clerics. Instead of this, they had put the choice wholly into the hands of the presbyters and deacons, dispensed with examination, kept the bishop uninformed, and sometimes taken money from persons thus 'ordained.'[1] Mr. Gwatkin says:—'The Benedictines say that those mentioned in *Ep.* 53 must be bishops, because only bishops can ordain presbyters. But this is begging the question' (p. 241). The Benedictines' note explains *Ep.* 53 of suffragan bishops, *Ep.* 54 of chorepiscopi proper, 'qui manus non imponebant.' We think their distinction erroneous; both letters seem to us to speak of the same class, which in *Ep.* 54 is clearly distinguished from presbyters. But, as to 'begging the question,' it had been settled at least some fifty years before in the famous case of Colluthus.[2]

There is another inconsistency between two passages, of which the earlier one seems more accurate than the later. 'It was agreed,' we are told, at the Council of Alexandria, in the summer of 362, 'that the Arians who came over to the Nicene side might retain their rank on condition of accepting the Nicene Council, and anathematizing not only open Arianism, but the more specious form of it which was content to speak of the Holy Spirit as a creature' (p. 205). But this statement is explicitly 'corrected' by a note in p. 233, in which it is said that 'even in his *Ad Antiochenos* Athanasius repeatedly denounces any attempt to go beyond the Nicene Creed, "as if it was in any respect deficient."' But in that passage he is speaking against the admission of a new *creed*; and the terms proposed for Meletius and his flock at Antioch expressly include an anathema against Pneumatomachism,[3] Sabellianism, Samosatenism, Valentinianism, Basilidianism, and Manichæism. Thus Mr. Gwatkin was right in his first statement.[4] Mr. Jenkins, indeed, in his *From the*

[1] *Epist.* 53, 54. [2] Comp. Ath. *Apol. c. Arian.* 76.

[3] Dr. Hort mentions this point, *Two Dissertations*, p. 95.

[4] At p. 232 Mr. Gwatkin says, 'While the Semiarians were coming to accept the Athanasian proof of the Lord's Divinity, the Nicenes were *beginning to see* that similar reasoning proved the same for the Holy Spirit. *It was hard on the Semiarians*, who were making up their minds for one advance, to find that the Nicenes were meditating another, and would be as far in front of them as ever.' Now, the first sentence is unintentionally 'corrected' in the next page, 'That Athanasius considered the deity of the Holy Spirit implicitly contained in the Nicene Creed is

Death of S. Athanasius to the Death of S. Basil, exaggerates rather seriously when he says that after A.D. 372 Basil made an 'addition to the creed' as to the adoration of the Holy Spirit. In 373 he did propose an anathema on those who called the Holy Spirit a creature;[1] but it was not until 377 that he approved the notion of adding anything to the creed on that subject.[2]

In connection with this point it may be observed that in p. 161 Mr. Gwatkin adopts Sozomen's statement as to Liberius having signed a composite Semiarian formula.[3] This is the most reasonable view. But in p. 188 he asks whether this will 'account for the strong words of Athanasius' and others? Athanasius, at any rate, used no 'strong language' on the matter. 'Liberius did not hold out to the end under the affliction of banishment.'[4] 'Liberius was banished, and ultimately, after two years, he broke down, and from fear of threatened death signed'—signed what?—a document repudiating Athanasius, as is clear from a preceding passage in the same *History of the Arians*; Eusebius, the emperor's agent, 'exhorted Liberius to sign against Athanasius.'[5] Athanasius says nothing of his accepting any formulary; this fact we learn elsewhere.

Let us now turn to some points in the intricate Athanasian chronology on which Mr. Gwatkin's views may be of interest to our readers. And, first, as to the accession of Athanasius. The Index to his 'Festal Letters' says that Alexander died on 22 Pharmuthi=17 April, in the consulate of Januarius and Justus, *i.e.* in 328, and that Athanasius succeeded him on the following 14 Payni=8 June. But Athanasius himself says that Alexander died within five months after the close of the Nicene Council;[6] and from a circular of his suffragans embodied in an earlier part of the same work, we learn that the Eusebians represented Athanasius as having been clandestinely elected after the death of Alexander,[7] which, by the way, seems to dispose of Epiphanius's two stories of the Meletian[8] election of Theonas,

clear,' &c. To quote from a writer of more truly theological mind, the Nicene fathers 'were content to reiterate the old faith in the Holy Ghost, which indeed virtually confessed, though it did not proclaim, His consubstantiality,' &c. (Swete, *Early Hist. of Doctrine of Holy Spirit*, p. 35. Dr. Swete, p. 60, does *not* think S. Basil, *c. Eunom.* ii. 33, 'reckless,' Gwatkin, p. 232.) In the second sentence Mr. Gwatkin has somewhat forgotten the seriousness of the subject.

[1] *Epist.* 113, 125. [2] *Epist.* 258. [3] Soz. iv. 15.
[4] Ath. *Apol. c. Arian.* 89. [5] Comp. Ath. *Hist. Arian.* 41, 35.
[6] *Apol. c. Arian.* 59. [7] *Ibid.* 6. [8] *Hær.* 68, 9; 69, 11.

and the Arian election of Achillas, during the absence of Athanasius, who was elected three months afterwards, on the death of Theonas or of Achillas. It is admitted that there was, at any rate, no long interval between the death of Alexander and the accession of Athanasius. When, then, did Alexander die? He must have returned from Nicæa before the end of 325; therefore, according to the natural sense of *Apol. c. Ari.* 59, he must have died before the summer of 326. Mr. Gwatkin tries to harmonize Athanasius's own statement with the Index by supposing that (1) his words do not refer to the decision come to about the Meletians in the Nicene Council, but to Alexander's own carrying out of that decision; and (2) 'Meletius and Alexander were in no hurry to carry out a compromise which neither of them much liked' (p. 66). But (1) Athanasius's words are express: 'In the Synod at Nicæa (on the one hand) the heresy was anathematized and the Arians expelled, and (on the other hand) the Meletians were somehow or other received (for it is not necessary now to state the reason). Well, five months had not passed when Alexander of blessed memory died, and the Meletians began again to harass the churches.' (2) Is it credible that Alexander would have delayed for some two years to execute the instructions of 'the holy and great Council,' so that the reconciliation provided for in 325 was not effected, nor the list of Meletian bishops and of Meletian clergy in Alexandria, handed in to Alexander, until the latter part of the November of 327? To us, at any rate, this is incredible. We can only, therefore, set aside the date in the Index as wrong by two years; for we presume that this document must give way when it comes fairly into collision with Athanasius himself. We may add, in regard to the supposition of a Meletian election, if not of an Arian as well, that by the very terms of the synodical letter, on which the reception of the Meletians was based, their bishops were to have no rights independently of, still less as opposed to, the legitimate Catholic occupants of sees. In the eye of the Church, therefore, they could not constitute a competent voting opposition at an election to the vacant primacy of Egypt. Moreover, Cyril of Alexandria says (*Ep.* 1) that Athanasius was bishop for 'full forty-six years'; and he died May 2, 373. We date his consecration, then, on June 8, 326.

Then as to the date of Athanasius's first restoration. All turns on the year to which the younger Constantine's letter answering it is to be assigned. It was written at Treves on June 17. Was this the June of 337 or of 338? Most writers

have preferred the latter date (Hefele, for instance, in his *Councils*, and Cardinal Newman in his *Historical Tracts of S. Athanasius*, have herein followed Pagi and Tillemont). Mr. Gwatkin pleads vigorously for the earlier. Probability, it may be said, is *primâ facie* against supposing that, even if Constantine II., being at Treves, could have heard of his father's death in Bithynia twenty-six days after it happened (and Mr. Gwatkin argues that a messenger could have got over the distance in that time), the very first thing that he would think of would be to provide for the restoration of an exiled bishop living under his protection, and undoubtedly enjoying his high esteem. If it is asked in rejoinder, 'Would he have made arrangements about the Church of Egypt after the September of 337, when in the partition of the empire that country was assigned to his brother Constantius?' it is obvious to reply that long before the June of 338 he might have come to an understanding with Constantine on that point. Again, we know from Athanasius that he met Constantius for the first time at Viminacium, in Mœsia Superior, evidently in the year of his return from Treves. Now, a law in *Cod. Theod.* x. 10, 4, dated at Viminacium on June 12, 338, is ascribed to Constantius. Mr. Gwatkin, indeed, argues (p. 138) that it should be ascribed to Constantine II. (and, indeed, at p. 108 freely refers to it as his), on the ground that Celsinus, the prefect to whom it is addressed, was certainly a subject of Constantine in January 339, as appears by a law of that date in *Cod. Theod.* xii. 1, 27. And, of course, if Constantine was at Viminacium on June 12, 338, his letter from Treves on June 17 must belong to the preceding year. Mr. Gwatkin also claims the support of the Festal Index, of the *Historia Acephala* or *Maffeian Fragment* of an Egyptian Church chronicle, of Theodoret, and of the tenth Festal Letter. As for the Index, it certainly puts the death of Constantine the Great and the return of Athanasius into one year, but it makes that year 338; and it might be said that the author simply transferred the former event from its proper year for convenience' sake, just as Gregory the Usurper's death is post-dated, in order to combine it with Athanasius's second return in 346. The *Historia Acephala* makes Athanasius stay at Treves 'menses xc et dies iii,' a statement which calls for emendation. As for Theodoret, Mr. Gwatkin has to correct the first chapter of his second book; for, as it stands, it makes that exile last two years and six months, which would exactly suit the date of 338 for Constantine II.'s letter. But the best argument for 337 may appear to be the tenth Festal

Letter, undoubtedly belonging to 338. Hefele understood the German version of the Syriac version of that letter as meaning that 'Athanasius was still away, but looking for a speedy return.' Cardinal Mai's Latin version of the Italian version of the Syriac version (alas, for the loss of the Greek text!) makes him describe himself as still absent from Egypt:—

'Non quia a vobis *absum* . . . iis tribulationibus *teneor*, quas vos sine dubio fando audistis . . . haud metuimus proclamationem hanc facere. . . Licet molestiis fraudibusque obsessi . . . ab extremis terræ partibus' (had he forgotten our island?) . . . 'pascha nostrum *significamus* . . . Jam cum ego sic festum *agam*, *opto* ut vos quoque . . . celebretis . . . Quodque homines minime potuerunt, id Deus facile factu *demonstrabit*, nos videlicet ad vos revocando,' &c.

But Dr. Burgess's version of the Syriac, in the *Library of the Fathers*, puts all this into the past tense: 'I *have* been all this distance from you . . . I *have* been kept in restraint . . . We *have* not feared, even when in the midst of such machinations, to indicate to you the saving paschal feast . . . I *was* desirous,' &c. 'And those things which could not be accomplished by man, God *hath* shown to be easy of accomplishment by bringing us to you.' In the context of these last words, according to both versions, he speaks of having obtained relief from trials; and in the end of the letter, after dwelling on the defeat of Arian and Meletian machinations against the faithful, he says: 'Our Lord hath caused us to pass through many trials and afflictions . . . to His holy Church, so that from hence, according to custom, we can send to you, as well as receive letters from you' ('ut hinc more solito ad vos mittere, vicissimque recipere litteras possemus,' Mai). The Latin version would be consistent with the supposition that Athanasius meant, 'I am writing to you from Treves as safely as if I were at home:' but, assuming the English version to be correct, 'from hence' must mean 'from Alexandria;' and then, the letter being accepted as genuine, Mr. Gwatkin's conclusion is proved without further argument; the return is fixed for 337, whatever difficulties that date may seem to involve. But we are permitted to quote a letter with which we have been favoured by a pre-eminent authority in Syriac—Dean Payne Smith, of Canterbury.

'Mai's is the more correct translation, as the words literally mean, "Though I have travelled so far . . . though I am still held . . . though place separates us . . . the things which among men are without accomplishment the Lord hath shown to be easy of accomplishment, in that He bringeth us to you." As the Syrians express the present and immediate future by the present participle, the above

passage might be rendered "will bring,"' &c. Thus 'it seems to show that Athanasius knew of his recall' (*i.e.* expected it as certain), 'but that he was still away. And such is, to my mind, the effect of the whole letter.'

But when did the second exile begin? Mr. Gwatkin says, in 339; and the Index is express to that effect. Now, if he had returned in 337, there would be time for the intervening Eusebian intrigues to take place before 339; certainly not if the return were in 338. He fled, as we learn from himself, after Easter Sunday; therefore early in April if in 340, later in April if in 339. Mr. Gwatkin argues that, if the Paschal season of 340 was the time of his flight to Rome, he must have already written his Paschal letter for that year, whereas none such is extant, and the Index says that none was written: but it may have been lost. There is another argument for 339: Theodoret assigns six years to Gregory's usurpation, which ended in 345; but he may have supposed it to synchronize with the second exile, which ended in 346. On the other hand, the *Historia Acephala* makes that exile last six years; but Mr. Gwatkin adopts an 'emendation'—'seven years and six months.' But the best argument, as it seems to us, for 340 as against 339 (always supposing the first return to be in 338) is that, according to Athanasius in his *Apologia ad Constantium*, Constans summoned him to Milan, in 'the fourth year' after his arrival, and just before the Council of Sardica. Now the meeting of that Council cannot well have been earlier than in the autumn of 343, for it was not until April of 344 that its envoys reached Antioch. It was then (as Hefele argues) in the summer that Athanasius went to Milan; if so, the 'fourth year' had begun in the April of that year; therefore, the flight to Rome was in the April of 340. Mr. Gwatkin meets this by dating the Council in the summer of 343, and placing the visit to Milan just before the end of the 'fourth year,' not at its commencement, so as to reckon the four years from the April of 339 (p. 120). But this, we think, is to ante-date the Council.

There is now no more question as to the time of the 'second return.' It was certainly in the October of 346. But the death of Gregory the Usurper is dated by the index on 2 Epiphi = 26 June—the June of 345, says Mr. Gwatkin, who takes this as a fixed point, as does Hefele. But in the *Hist. Arian.* (which, if not written wholly by Athanasius, was at least written under his cognizance), we find that the detection of the abominable plot of Stephen of Antioch was at the Easter following the Council of Sardica; that Stephen was

thereupon deposed (of course by a synod); that Constantius, 'feeling some slight compunction,' recalled the Catholic exiles, and took off the ban from the Catholics of Egypt; that 'Gregory died ten months afterwards,' whereupon Constantius sent for Athanasius. It was the Easter of 344, which fell on April 15; the ten months may be reckoned from May to the March of 345, so that the Index has wrongly put Epiphi for Pharmuthi. Mr. Gwatkin falls into an oversight when he dates Stephen's deposition 'three years after the Council of the Dedication in the summer of 341' (p. 105), neglecting the Athanasian note of time given above; whereas he says afterwards, quite rightly, that the plot was detected about Easter, and that 'a new Council was called; by which Stephen was deposed' and the 'Macrostich' formula put forth (p. 124).

Again, Mr. Gwatkin thinks that we may follow 'the circumstantial narratives of the Index and the *Historia Acephala*,' and defer the intrusion of George of Cappadocia until Feb. 24, 357, 'in the absence of anything directly contrary in Ath. *De Fuga*' (p. 152). To this we demur. Athanasius, after referring to the night attack on the church, which is absolutely fixed for February, and, we agree with Mr. Gwatkin, for February 8, in 356, goes on to say, 'Then George arrived in Lent,' February 8 having been before Lent; for Easter Day in 356 fell on April 7. He then describes successive outrages committed against his people after Holy Week and after 'the holy Pentecost'—outrages which Mr. Gwatkin, in the context, clearly refers to 357. Could Athanasius have written thus in 357–8, if a whole year had intervened between the night attack and the arrival of the intruder?

One other date of some interest is that of the disputation between Photinus and Basil of Ancyra, usually dated—as by Tillemont and Hefele—after the great Council of Sirmium in 351. Mr. Gwatkin is inclined to postpone it until 355, because (1) Constantius was then at Sirmium, and could not have resisted 'the attractions of a great theological debate;' (2) one of the high state-officers present at the discussion seems to have been in Syria from March 351 to 353; (3) Photinus's appeal 'is better placed not so soon after the Council of 351' (p. 146).

The date of the Council of Gangra is very minutely discussed, and the result is that it is placed about 340, before Eustathius became a bishop, and under the presidency of Eusebius of Constantinople, formerly of Nicomedia (p. 185). The Council of Lampsacus is dated, not in 365, according to

Socrates, but in the summer of 364, according to Sozomen; and this is supported by a passage from Philostorgius, to the effect that Eudoxius was specially honoured by Valens at the end of that year. But Tillemont's reasoning in favour of 365 is not met by Mr. Gwatkin.

Basil died on the New Year's Day of 379, having 'met little but disappointment, and quitting life prematurely in pain and sorrow.'[1] Had he lived two years longer, he would have seen the Church's prospects brighten under the reign of Theodosius. And yet, as Mr. Gwatkin remarks, the prelates who assembled at Constantinople at the summons of a monarch who had already made the faith of Rome and Alexandria a test of orthodoxy would hardly have had a 'more joyous feeling than that of thankfulness that the weary strife was coming to an end.' Their 'first canon was a solemn ratification of the Nicene Creed in its original shape.' Mr. Gwatkin refers in a note to Dr. Hort's 'decisive' proof that the so-called Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed 'is not a revision of the Nicene Creed at all, but Cyril's Jerusalem formula, and that it cannot have had any sanction from the Council beyond an incidental approval when Cyril's case came before them' (p. 262). We are thus led to observe that Dr. Hort, in the second of his *Two Dissertations*, argues that this form of creed, which, as every one knows, was substantially extant when Epiphanius wrote his *Ancoratus* 'about 374,' is really based on the 'creed of the Mother Church of Christendom,' as exhibited in Cyril's *Catechetical Lectures*. 'The first six lines ending with *πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων*, are copied exactly from the Jerusalem Creed,' except that *Θεὸν ἀληθινόν* is 'reserved for its Nicene place lower down.' Granted that these lines are identical with those in the Creed of Jerusalem: the first and fourth lines, however, are in the Nicene Creed as well. But, proceeds Dr. Hort, 'at this point ("before all ages") the scanty language of Jerusalem is enlarged by a long insertion from the Nicene Creed' . . . including 'seven lines without change and almost without interruption from *φῶς ἐκ φωτός* to *κατέλθοντα*, to which last word is added *ἐκ τῶν οὐράνων* . . . Henceforward to the end there is not a trace of unquestionable Nicene influence,' for *παθόντα*, though Nicene, was also Cæsarean and Antiochene, and *τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*, although 'nearer to *τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα* (Nicene) than to *ἐν ἅγιον Πνεῦμα* (Jerusalem), is supplied exactly by the Apostolic Constitutions, the Cappadocian creed, and at least the early

[1] Newman, *Church of the Fathers*, p. 51, ed. 4.

or Lucianic creed of Antioch. Thus the "Constantinopolitan Creed" in its conciliar form owes nothing to the Nicene *except one long extract*, with a single clause omitted;' and 'this long Nicene extract incorporates the whole parallel language of Jerusalem.' Dr. Hort also calls attention to the fact that *καὶ ταφέντα*,—*καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Πατρός*,—*μετὰ δόξης*, —and the remarkable clause about the endlessness of Christ's kingdom, are all from Jerusalem, except that Jerusalem has *καθίσαντα*. Of course as to what follows the words 'Holy Spirit' there can be no question; for there the original Nicene Creed came to an end, and its anathemas began.

We have quoted thus from Dr. Hort, in order to exhibit the substance of his argument; but we think it somewhat overstrained. Let us read the 'long extract:' 'Light from Light; Very God from Very God; begotten, not made; of one substance (essence) with the Father; by Whom all things were made; Who for us men and for our salvation came down.' Thus the 'extract' contains just the very heart and pith of the Nicene Confession, that in which Nicene teaching was concentrated with the Homoousion as its centre. And in those days to be Homoousian in faith was precisely to be Nicene in faith. When men asked in anxiety whether a person adhered to the Nicene Fathers, they meant in effect, 'Does he hold the Homoousion as distinct from the Homoiousion and the Homoion?' The previous clause, *Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ*, might well come to be thought needless when *Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ* was to follow. The parenthesis, *τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρός*, which in the original Creed explains *ἐκ τοῦ Πατρός*, is also absent; and when Mr. Gwatkin says, in his trenchant way, 'Surely Athanasius would have had an anathema for the men who had left out the all-important *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας*,' he seems to forget that he had said before, that as early as 359 'the Semiarians seem to have accepted *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας* without any scruples' (p. 173), and had represented Athanasius, rightly enough, as saying in his *De Synodis* that Homoiousion and *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας* 'together are precisely equivalent to Homoousion'[1] (p. 177). If so, when Homoousion was acknowledged as an indispensable and inviolable formula, the explanatory words bringing out the true sense of 'begotten of the Father' might drop out of use.

But to return to Dr. Hort. Granted that this central extract includes 'Jerusalem materials,' such as 'true God,' and

[1] In p. 42, indeed, Mr. Gwatkin says that 'in the *Orationes* Homoousion is only found i. 9.' He has overlooked *Orat.* iv. 9, 12.

'by Whom all things were made,' why may not the compiler have taken this language immediately from the world-famous Nicene symbol, and not from the provincial creed, which may well, as Dr. Hort says, have furnished suggestions for the Nicene? And as to the portion beginning 'And was incarnate,' why, under such circumstances, are we to say that the compiler must have had a Cæsarean or Antiochene document, or that in the Apostolic Constitutions, before him, and that when he *does* use terms used by the Nicene Fathers he was indebted to it instead of to Nicæa? Surely this is not a natural hypothesis, until we have *proved* not only (1) that the compiler in question was an ex-Semiarian of Palestine, such as Cyril of Jerusalem, but also that (2) while at work, he would *look away*, so to speak, from the Nicene Creed as such, and rather borrow from any other quarter. Dr. Hort argues for this former hypothesis, and in doing so suggests that Cyril, having 'throughout' an 'attachment in mind' to Athanasius, was led to accept 'the Nicene language' about the time of Athanasius's Council of Alexandria, say 362 or 363, and that he then revised his diocesan creed by inserting some of that language into it. If so, he may surely have been at least as ready to copy from the Nicene form on points not in controversy as to adopt the most characteristic test-words of 'the 318.' We grant, however, that the compiler did draw very considerably on the Jerusalem Creed, and took it so far as a 'base.' Only, the parts taken straight from Nicæa are the most critical of all: they give the whole a significantly Nicene character; they make it perpetuate the Nicene tradition. In *this* sense, which touches doctrine rather than mere diction, we should say that the formulary had a Nicene rather than a Jerusalem 'base,' and it is this point which seems to us not fully exhibited by Dr. Hort. And as for a solemn 'ratification' of the Nicene Creed, the like was done at Chalcedon too, yet a second formula was synodically sanctioned. He admits that the present creed 'may have been submitted to the council by one of its members'—probably, he thinks, by Cyril, when some of the old Church party had impugned his orthodoxy; that the council accepted the formulary 'as legitimate, without any idea of its becoming in any sense an œcumenical symbol, regulating the faith of many lands;' and that, after this approval had been expressed, his creed gained a Constantinopolitan 'currency,' and in time 'came to be represented as the creed of the council itself.' If, then, we do not contend for more than a secondary authorization of this creed at the Council of 381, that much Dr. Hort vir-

tually concedes. He takes note of Nestorius's quotation of one of its features, as if it were part of 'the Fathers' Creed,' 'to the bewilderment of Cyril.' Flavian of Constantinople also, in his letter to Theodosius II., referred to the 'exposition' of the Council of 381 in combination with that of the Nicene; the Imperial commissioners at Chalcedon did the like; and not only did Aetius the archdeacon, as Mr. Gwatkin observes, adduce it, but in the fourth session a number of bishops, including Theodoret, spoke of an 'exposition' or 'a symbol of faith' as set forth by the Council of Constantinople (whereas in 431 both Cyril and the Orientals had used the Nicene Creed only), while others said only that 'the 150' confirmed the Nicene faith.[1] In the 'Definition' the Council, after referring to the 'exposition' of the 318 and to what was defined by the 150, recites both in a form to which Dr. Hort draws attention. The Nicene Creed is made to include certain 'Constantinopolitan' additions (among which are the two titles of the Holy Spirit, *τὸ κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιόν*), and then the 'Constantinopolitan' Creed follows in its entirety. Then the Council speaks of 'this . . . . salutary symbol' as, properly speaking, 'sufficient;' which Dr. Hort, appealing to the whole context, interprets of the Nicene Creed alone. Be it so; but observe that the 'symbol' here recited is not the creed of 325 pure and simple, but that creed as enlarged in regard to the Incarnation, and partially in regard to the Holy Spirit. After it, as we have said, comes the 'Constantinopolitan;' *then*, not before, the sentence about sufficiency; 'for the symbol teaches[2] the perfect truth as to the Trinity and the Incarnation;' and the 'Definition' proceeds, in effect, 'but since some have denied the singleness of Christ's Person, and others the duality of His Natures, we therefore first proclaim the Nicene Creed to be inviolable; next, we confirm the formula of Constantinople, which was put forth not as if to supply a defect in what had preceded, but to exclude the Pneumatomachi; then we

[1] See Mansi, *Concil.* vi. 541, 937, vii. 13 ff. Eutyches did not 'appeal to the Nicene Creed at the first session of Chalcedon' (Hort, p. 113), for he was not there. His 'appeal' was made at the Latrocinium. At Chalcedon Diogenes said that Eutyches had formerly quoted the Nicene Creed *minus* the 'additions.' Dr. Hort urges that to treat these passages as *added* to the creed is one thing, and to treat the 'Constantinopolitan' formulary as distinct is another. But the Council of Chalcedon did both.

[2] Mansi, vii. 109. Ἐκδιδάσκει, applied, on Dr. Hort's showing, to the Nicene Creed. A creed, then, might be called, as the Constantinopolitan formulary is, a διδασκαλία. Compare *μάθημα*.

sanction the teaching of Cyril and Leo, as against those who would mar the full doctrine of the Incarnation.'[1]

To bring these remarks to an end. We have felt it right to indicate some points in Mr. Gwatkin's work which, as we think, need reconsideration.[2] But it must be understood that there are several passages which, had space permitted it, we would gladly have quoted without any deduction of the kind; what such an author has to say, for instance, in those on the character of Constantine the Great, on Jewish influence, on S. Hilary, on the Councils of Ancyra and Seleucia, &c. He has produced an important book, which ought to be consulted by all students of the history of a memorable period. And those who do so use it will appreciate it as a monument of wide and varied reading, of that true scholarly energy which deems no detail too minute for industrious investigation, and of the power which can call back the past into the present; although they may think that he would succeed still better in treating civil history from a Christian point of view.[3]

ART. VIII.—THE NOMENCLATURE OF ENGLISH DISSENT.

Jubilee Lectures: a Historical Series delivered on the occasion of the Jubilee of the Congregational Union of England and Wales. 2 vols. (London: 1882.)

I.

A NOVEL and unhistorical nomenclature is employed by the modern Liberationists in order to disguise or to avoid recognizing three historical facts. These facts are: (1) that the Nonconformists were always Churchmen, were what Mr. Dale and Mr. Rogers now call 'Conformists;' (2) that the Independents, Baptists, and other 'sectaries' were never at any time Nonconformists, but were always Separatists; (3)

[1] We do not defend the Council for not quoting the Nicene text strictly, instead of in a transitional form, enlarged from the 'Constantinopolitan.'

[2] We might have questioned 'the general rule that Christianity flourished best where cities were not numerous' (p. 241). What of the word *Pagan*?

[3] Contrast, *e.g.*, the treatment of Valens's persecution with that of his Gothic war.

that the Presbyterians only ceased to be Nonconformists and became Dissenters when they instituted and ordained a Separatist ministry. Mr. Rogers has tried to answer the demonstration made in these pages that 'Congregationalists are the descendants of the Separatists, not of the Puritans, and are consequently not Nonconformists, but Dissenters.'[1] His answer scarcely pretends to be a confutation. Indeed, after a little needless abuse of 'the champion of the Anglo-Catholic theory' he concedes one-half of the position. 'As to the historic fact,' says Mr. Rogers, 'Congregationalists fully agree with him that they are the direct heirs of the Separatists of history.' But Mr. Rogers shrinks from conceding the other half of the position, that as the Congregationalists are the direct heirs of those with whom the Nonconformists of history were always at war, the modern Liberationist Independent or Baptist has as much right to call himself a Nonconformist as a modern Persian has to call himself an ancient Greek. A man may hold that Blake and Van Tromp were alike patriots, as Nonconformists and Separatists were alike Calvinists; but he cannot be allowed to infer from one common point of likeness that Blake may be called a Hollander and Van Tromp an Englishman, or that Robert Brown may be called a Nonconformist and Archbishop Usher be called a Separatist.

'Congregationalists smile at all this,' says Mr. Rogers, 'when regarded as a mere question of words.' Yet the Jubilee lecturers, Mr. Dale, Mr. Kennedy, and Mr. Rogers himself, show that they perceive it to be a question of words, for they all scrupulously avoid ever using the word 'Nonconformist' in that sense in which it was used, both by friend and foe, throughout the period between the Elizabethan and the Caroline Acts of Uniformity. Whenever Mr. Rogers is obliged to contradistinguish the Nonconformists and Separatists, he calls the former 'Puritans.' Even this concession that the Puritan was an Anti-Separatist is somewhat dangerous, for it robs the Liberationist Separatists of the privilege of boasting of 'our Puritan forefathers.' Why has not Mr. Rogers the courage to tell his readers the plain truth that 'Puritan' and 'Nonconformist' were two names for one and the same person, and that this person was as invariably an opponent of Separation as he was of Conformity?

Mr. Dale and Mr. Kennedy appear to be quite aware that the Puritans or Nonconformists, equally with the Con-

[1] *Jubilee Lectures.* Lect. x. 'Clericalism and Congregationalism,' vol. ii. pp. 213, &c.

formists, were Anti-Separatists, Anti-Dissenters, Anti-Congregationalists—that the Nonconformists were in truth what the Jubilee lecturers would now call 'Conformists.' But they apparently try to hide this fact from their readers by their invention and employment of a new qualifying nomenclature. They diligently label the Puritans or Nonconformists—even the 'Episcopal Nonconformists' of whom Baxter speaks—as 'Presbyterian Puritans,' or as 'Moderate Puritans.' This is done in order to make a loophole through which the Independent, the Anabaptist, and the Quaker can creep into the Puritan or Nonconformist orchard. It is implied that the hereditary foes of Nonconformity—the Brownists, the Separatist fathers of Independency and Anabaptism, the original Congregational Dissenters—were actually known to their contemporaries as 'the Congregationalist Puritans,' or as 'the Extreme Puritans,' and that the genus 'Nonconformist' contained a species recognized as 'Separatist.'[1] The nomenclature of the Jubilee lecturers is utterly unhistorical, and it has evidently been invented to meet the controversial necessities of modern Liberationists. After boasting of their 'Puritan and Nonconformist ancestors,' they have found out that the Puritans or Nonconformists were not their ancestors at all, but were the most bitter of all the foes of their ancestors. No Puritan, from the primacy of Whitgift to the primacy of Laud, looked upon his foes the Separatists as fellow-Nonconformists. No Separatist throughout that period claimed to be a fellow-Puritan with the Nonconformists. The mass of the English Nonconformists at the opening of the Long Parliament were not Presbyterians; much less were they Separatists, Independents, or Baptists; even those who had a subjective preference for the Presbyterian discipline held that every Anglican prelate was a true presbyter, and that ordination by the bishops was sufficiently 'presbyterial' to justify the Nonconformists for remaining in the Church and to condemn the Independents for separating from it. Those Nonconformists who held with the Scots that Presbyterianism alone had the *jus divinum*, and urged monarchs and parliaments to abolish the episcopate as well as the 'nocent ceremonies,' were not 'the Moderate Puritans,' as the Jubilee lecturers label them, but were the immoderate Left of English Puritanism. Even they, however, regarded the Church of England, in spite of its anti-Christian episcopacy and ritual, as a true Church, and were fierce opponents of

[1] 'Patricke Scot, North Brittainne,' in his *Vox Vera, or Observations from Amsterdam*, 1625, 4to. pp. 62, examines 'the insolencies of some *Pseudo-Puritans*, *Separatists* from the Church of Great Brittainne.'

'schism,' by which they meant Congregationalist Independency and Anabaptism.

It is only fair to the Jubilee lecturers to suggest that their confused and misleading nomenclature may be due to the too implicit confidence which they have placed in the official English historian of Independency. The English Independents, as a rule, know very little actually and nothing scientifically of the history of their sect. They seriously accept, without attempt at verification, whatever the late Benjamin Hanbury thought fit to communicate to them.[1] Until the appearance of the American Dr. Dexter's elaborate and orderly researches, Hanbury's diffuse collection of excerpts and annotations was the storehouse from which the historians and lecturers of Congregationalism drew their materials. Hanbury, in spite of the thousandfold evidence constantly before his eyes, either could not or would not see the fundamental difference between the Nonconformists and the Separatists. When he is chronicling their ceaseless battles he terms the former 'Puritans,' even though in the text before him they call themselves 'Nonconformists,' because he will not withhold that term from the Separatists, or because he cannot consent to place in a bad light anyone called a Nonconformist. Thus when he cites the bitter charge of the Separatist Francis Johnson against his Nonconformist adversary—'You carry yourself as if you had been chaplain to Bonner, Bancroft, Whitgift, or some other Caiaphas; not the prelates alone, but you also have your hands in our blood'—Hanbury observes, 'It is with pain that we have occasion to recur to the persecuting spirit of the *Puritans*.' Why does he not say the persecuting spirit of the *Nonconformists*? George Giffard, the Nonconformist, the early adversary of the Brownist Independents, was cited before the High Commission for Nonconformity shortly before the Brownist Independents were cited before it for separation. Hanbury seems to think that the name of 'Nonconformist' is too sacred to be given to the most vigorous and trenchant assailant of the Separatist. He invents a nomenclature for the occasion, and labels Giffard as 'a Conformist, though a Puritan.'[2] Giffard was actually suspended for *not* being a Conformist! Hanbury accepted the utterly false *Sage* of Liberationism that a Nonconformist does not mean one who will not conform, but means one who will

[1] *Historical Memorials relating to the Independents or Congregationalists.* Published for the Congregational Union of England and Wales. 3 vols. 1839.

[2] I. 49. 'Giffard was a Puritan Conformist.'

separate. He thought that the founders of Congregationalist separation must be the true and genuine Nonconformists, and therefore refuses the title to the real Nonconformists who wrote against them. He differentiates the Separatists Barrowe and Greenwood, whom he praises, from the Nonconformists Giffard and others, whom he abuses, by stating that the former had 'only seceded wider than themselves from a Romanized Establishment.' Giffard had never seceded any distance from the 'Romanized Establishment,' but remained a zealous member and minister in it, appealing to the civil power to de-romanize it after the model of Scotland, Geneva, and Amsterdam. When Hanbury describes the Hampton Court Conference he is again obliged to resort to a nomenclature of his own in order to avoid owning that the Nonconformists were not Separatists. 'The despised Separatists,' he says, 'had no representative there.' It was 'a farcical conference between the High and *Low Church* parties, for we cannot here speak of the *Puritan Conformists* but as Churchmen.'[1] Those for whom he invents the nomenclature 'Puritan Conformists' called themselves 'Nonconformists,' and were so called by their contemporaries, as Hanbury must have known, though he may not have thought it prudent to let the Congregationalist Union know it.

II.

The Nonconformist invariably regarded himself as a member of the Church of England, while he regarded every Separatist as a schismatic from the Church. 'John Dayrell, who is always styled a Nonconformist by his Separatist opponents, "showed his best skill, wit, and learning," says Canne, to prove the Parish Assemblies true Churches: he attempted to confute the description which Mr. Barrowe and the Brownists, as he maliciously names God's People, have laid down of a true visible Church.'[2] The earliest Nonconformists troubled themselves little about the *jure divino* claims either of the Episcopate or the Presbyterians. The Puritanism of the English Nonconformists may have been a native growth; the later Presbyterianism of many of them was a foreign importation. The majority of the English Nonconformists, however, was at no period deliberately Presby-

[1] I. 121.

[2] *A Necessity of Separation*, 201. Cf. *A Treatise of the Church, written against them of the Separation, commonly called Brownists; wherein the true doctrine of a Visible Church is taught, and the Church of England proved to be a True Church.* By J. Dayrell, 1617.

terian, and the Presbyterians amongst them looked upon themselves as members of the Church. They defended, against the sneer of the Separatists, the orders conferred by the bishops, on the ground that every English bishop, though a prelate, was a true presbyter. Baxter states that when the Long Parliament first assembled, though it was full of Nonconformists, it had only one avowed Presbyterian amongst its members—Mr. Tate, the elect of Northampton. Robert Baillie, the Scottish emissary for the Presbyterianizing of the English Church, told his correspondent Spang that 'the learnedest and most considerable part of the clergy were fully episcopal.' He was speaking of the Nonconformists by whose help the Scots had 'gotten England *Reformed*'—he means 'Presbyterianized.' Hence he goes on to say, 'Of those who joined with the Parliament the greatest and most countenanced part were much episcopal.[1] Although the Westminster Assembly has become by accident to British and American Presbyterianism much what the Œcumenical Council of Nicæa has become to the Catholic Church, although it nearly succeeded in Presbyterianizing the Church of England, it was never really a Presbyterian synod. "The assembly of learned and godly divines" was convoked by the Lords and Commons not to form some new Church or Churches—the ideal of the Separatists—but "to be consulted with by the Parliament" for the reform of the already existing or Established Church, or, as the ordinance runs, "for the settling of the government and liturgy of the Church of England, and for clearing and vindicating the doctrine of the said Church."'[2] This was the traditional ideal of the Nonconformists. The whole language of the Presbyterianizing 'Solemn League and Covenant' implies that the Church of England was one and the same body before and after its purgation from 'Popery and prelacy.' Nineteen years after the restoration of the episcopate, Baxter, in one of his latest appeals to 'the reverend fathers and brethren the Conforming clergy,' reminded them that the English Nonconformists, as a whole, had never been really Presbyterianized. He said that three classes of Nonconformists had been ejected by the Act of Uniformity. (1) 'Some of them were episcopal, and for as much as Richard Hooker writeth for, and were against the (Presbyterian) covenant, and never took it. (2) Besides these and other *Episcopal Nonconformists*, some, and very many, and we think the greatest part of any, were disengaged *Pacificators*,' who held neither the

[1] December 27, 1644 : *Letters* ii. 81.
[2] Ordinance, June 12, 1643.

traditional episcopacy of the Catholic Church nor the presbyterianism of the foreign Calvinist or 'Reformed' Churches and of the Westminster Assembly to be *jure divino*. These, said Baxter, held that each 'had something of the right,' and that none of the parties were so right as that in all things they should be followed.' It is probable that a bold adoption by the bishops of the synodical system of the Primitive Church, and the restoration of the clergy of the second order to their constitutional position as co-rulers with the bishop, would have reconciled this 'greatest part' of the Nonconformists. (3) 'Some,' Baxter adds, 'were for the Presbyterian government.' Some of the ministers who were then in possession of the parish churches 'were for that which is called Independency.' 'These,' he adds, 'were comparatively but few.' Still fewer were the beneficed Baptists, Seekers, and other 'sectaries,' as the Nonconformists called them, who represented the extreme 'dissidence of Dissent.' Neither of these latter classes, Independents, Baptists, and miscellaneous sectaries, could properly be called Nonconformists, since they one and all 'gathered Churches' out of the actual Church, which they held to be a mere subsection of 'the world.' They would not own that the Church was already gathered and established, and were consequently Separatists or anti-Nonconformists. Baxter indignantly complained to the bishops in 1679 that it had become the habit, as he thought maliciously, 'to call all the Nonconformists that were episcopal or neutral by the name of *Presbyterians*, even those that had declared themselves against the Presbyterian frame; and they continue that practice to serve their ends unto this day.'[1] We may add that there has never been a time in which the National Church has not included a class of 'Episcopal Nonconformists,' both amongst her clergy and laity.[2] A sort of loose and vague Nonconformity was established in England by the Long Parliament; but neither that Erastian body nor its equally Erastian successor, Oliver Cromwell, would permit a definitive Presbyterian Nonconformity to be established. Many of the ejected incumbents of 1660–1662, however, lived long enough to see Presbyterian Nonconformity established in the sister nation of Scotland as the religion of the State and the parishes.

[1] *The Nonconformists' Plea for Peace, or an Account of their Judgment in certain things in which they are Misunderstood*, 12mo., 1679, pp. 130, 135–137. At p. 139 he again speaks of 'Episcopal and Presbyterian Nonconformists.'

[2] Toplady, *Works*, vol. vi. 149, 1768.

III.

It is not only a demonstrable fact that the word 'Nonconformist' did not bear the meaning which the Liberationists and Jubilee lecturers now thrust into it, but it is an equally demonstrable fact that it meant the *very opposite* of that which they now pervert it to mean. A Nonconformist meant one who was *not* an actual Dissenter, one who was *no* Separatist. The Separatists had to combat two opponents, the Conformists and the Nonconformists; but most of their controversial campaigns during a hundred years of war were against the latter, whom they hoped to take prisoners. The battle between the Nonconformists and Separatists was quite as fierce and incessant as that between the Nonconformists and the Conformists. It did not wholly cease when both were discomfited together and driven into a sort of league by the Act of Uniformity of 1662 and the subsequent cruel legislation. We may detect some renewal of it in the modern quarrels of the Independents and Presbyterians before the law courts and in Parliament over the ownership of chapels built for the ejected Nonconformists of 1660–1662 and participation in Lady Hewley's Bounty.[1]

The Nonconformists even made it their boast that they were the very foremost anti-Separatists and anti-Dissenters. Dissent, 'the Dissension,' and 'the Separation,' we may here observe, were used by both sides as accepted synonyms from the beginning of the conflict between the Nonconformists and the Dissenters; but the technical substitution of the word 'Dissenter' for the earlier word 'Separatist' did not come into general use until the appearance of Philip Nye and his Independent co-assessors in the Westminster Assembly of Divines. While Conformists like Whitgift, Bancroft, Hooker, and Laud were controverting the Nonconformists and exposing their inevitable tendency to pass from the stage of a Nonconforming *party* within the Church to the stage of a separated *sect* outside the Church, the Nonconformists themselves were as diligently controverting the Separatists. The English Nonconformists, by opposing all and any objective

[1] Contrast the *Rise of the Old Dissent exemplified in the Life of Oliver Heywood*, 1630–1702, by the Rev. Joseph Hunter, F.S.A. (1842), and *History of an English Presbyterian Church*, by Henry Ierson, M.A. (1861), with the *History of the Litigation and Legislation respecting Presbyterian Chapels and Charities in England and Ireland between* 1816 *and* 1849, by T. S. James, 1867, pp. 872. The Nonconformist side is represented by the Presbyterian Mr. Hunter and Mr. Ierson, the Separatist side by the Congregational Independent Mr. James.

dissent as the sin of schism, were closely following the example of their ideal, the 'Reformed Churches' of Scotland, the Netherlands, the Palatinate of the Rhine, Geneva, and Zürich. As early as 1568 Grindal, then Bishop of London, detected the fundamental difference between the English Nonconformists and the English Separatists. In one of his letters to Heinrich Bullinger, the Antistes of the Reformed Church of Zürich, he said that the Separatists had not merely left the Church of England and 'ordained ministers, elders, and deacons after their own fashion,' but had even excommunicated the Nonconformist ministers who remained within the Church, such as Thomas Lever, Lawrence Humphrey, Thomas Sampson, and other early confessors of Nonconformity, 'qui multa passi sunt pro libertate circa res adiaphoras obtinenda.' 'Because they (the Elizabethan Nonconformists) will not join with them (the Separatists) they now regard them as semi-Papists, and will not permit their members to hear their sermons.' [1] The position would be exactly the same in our day if Dr. Allon and Mr. Rogers, or the Independents of Islington and Clapham, were to prohibit the members of their Separatist 'Churches' from hearing a sermon by any clerical member of the Church Association, because every clerical member of the Church Association has been ordained and licensed by a prelate, and is consequently a 'semi-Papist.' The enmity between Nonconformist and Separatist was kept up in each camp as a sacred heritage. We need scarcely repeat that Thomas Cartwright, the ideal champion of Nonconformity, whom Fuller calls 'the chief of the Nonconformists,' and Stillingfleet calls 'the ringleader of the Nonconformists,' was the most vehement opponent of separation from the Church of England. Twenty years after the Act of Uniformity Bishop Stillingfleet reminded some of the Nonconformists that by ordaining 'ministers' and gathering 'congregations' they were forsaking the root principle of their fathers and perverting themselves into Separatists. 'The Separation being now begun, the Nonconformists set themselves against it with the greatest vehemency. When Brown and Harrison openly declared for *separation* Thomas Cartwright himself undertook to answer them.' [2] The example of the idolized leader was

[1] 'Quia sese cum illis non conjungunt, pro semi-papistis jam habent, neque illorum conciones audire suis permittunt.'—*Epistolæ Tigurinæ*, ep. xxxii. 119. *Zürich Letters*, 202. These Nonconformists were ministering in London without 'the habits,' but with the tacit consent of the Bishop.

[2] *The Unreasonableness of Separation*, 4to. 1682, pp. 27, 28.

followed by other eminent members of the party.[1] John Udall, Cartwright's fellow-prisoner for Nonconformity, wrote to Sir Walter Raleigh in 1590, 'I utterly renounce from my heart the *schism* whereunto the Brownists have fallen in condemning the Church of England, and separating themselves from communicating in the public ministry thereof.'[2] An immense flood of anti-Separatist literature poured forth from the Nonconformist press. The Nonconformists boasted that while they were being persecuted by the bishops it was due to them rather than to the bishops and Conformists that 'the godly'—that is to say, the Calvinistic and Puritanical—were being still retained in communion with the National Church, and hindered from joining the Independent sectaries. 'As for those of the Separation,' asked the Nonconformist Parker in 1607, 'who have confuted them more than we, or who have written more against them?'[3] 'There was never any prelate,' said Dr. Ames, 'that confuted the opinion of Separatists any otherwise than by railing words; whereas on this side (the Nonconformist) divers most averse to Conformity have soundly confuted them.'[4] Canne states that the Nonconformists in 1634 were still priding themselves upon being 'the main refuters of the Separatists. Whom do they take for greater enemies than the Separatists? Many of us have received most grievous injuries both from their tongues and hands.'[5] Canne, in his summary of 'the point between the Nonconformists and us,' complains of 'the boasts and brags of victory, the vile calumniations and bitter scoffs' of the Nonconformists

[1] The Nonconformist S. Bredwell in 1588 affirmed the principle of Nonconformity against the principle of Dissent in 'three chief conclusions,' as he names them: (1) 'It may be a true Church of God that hath in it divers corruptions both in doctrine and practice; (2) the Church of England is not more unsound than divers Churches have been from which no separation was counselled; (3) no man ought to separate himself from the Church of England for the defects and corruptions that are therein.'—*The Rasing of the Foundations of Brownisme*, 4to. pp. 145. Cf. 'Epistle Dedicatorie.'

[2] Waddington, ii. 64, 66.

[3] *A Scholastic Discourse against Symbolizing with Antichrist in Ceremonies, especially the Sign of the Cross.* Fol. Two parts. 1607. Part ii. ch. ix.

[4] Reported by Dr. John Burgess in his *Answer to a Pamphlet of a Nameless Author*, 1631. The nameless author was Dr. W. Ames, who had attacked Bishop Morton for his defence of 'the three nocent ceremonies.' Burgess observes, 'I know not that ever any prelate, if he thereby means a bishop, hath at all written in confutation of the Brownists. I have seen some of the Inconformists' confutations, which, I confess, never satisfied my conscience' (238).

[5] *Necess. of Separation*, 227, 228.

in their controversies with the Separatists, 'proclaiming us to the world to be schismatics, Brownists, Donatists, &c., and matching us with the most notorious heretics and blasphemers that they can think upon.'[1] He cites the venerated Nonconformists Hildersham, Dayrell, and Nichols, as conspicuous offenders, and retorts upon them that 'in their Church, the Church of England, their ministry, worship, and discipline is from Antichrist; and in their Church are swarms of atheists, Papists, erroneous and heretical sectaries, witches, charmers, murderers, thieves, adulterers, liars, &c. &c.' The famous Nonconformist confessor Alexander Leighton, the author of the ferocious *Appeal to the Parliament* against the prelacy, was quite as fervent in his hatred of Separatism as in his hatred of Laud and the ceremonies.[2] He charged the bishops with indirectly promoting the cause of the Separatists by imposing 'the infectious liturgy and Popish stuff' upon the parish churches. The Separatist Canne replied, 'I think the man knows better,' and complained of 'this man's insolent boasting against us, and the untrue report which he giveth forth of his refuting the chiefest Separatists.'[3] The Nonconformist Parker asserted that 'Satan' moved the Conformists 'to fling the dung of that sect—the Separatists—into my face, which, with all my power, I had so vehemently resisted during the whole course of my ministry in England.'[4] Two things are observable throughout the period between the rise of Congregationalist Separatism and its partial co-establishment at the side of Nonconformity by the Cromwellian army—first, that the Conformists and Nonconformists ceaselessly accused one another of being the indirect authors of objective dissent in England; secondly, that the Nonconformists invariably called the fathers and adherents of Congregational Independency 'schismatics,' because they separated from the communion of the National Church and established new communions in opposition to it. The Nonconformist George Giffard joined with the rest of his party in

[1] Preface, cxx.-cxxii. It is worth notice that the Nonconformists and Separatists agreed in condemning the historical heretics and schismatics condemned by the Church Councils.

[2] *An Appeal to the Parliament; or, Sion's Plea against the Prelacy*, 'printed in the year and month wherein Rochelle was lost' (Oct. 1628).

[3] *Necess. of Sep.* 169, 170, 173.

[4] *A Scholastic Discourse*, &c. (v. s.) Robert Parker was successively parish priest of three parishes in Essex, was suspended for Nonconformity, left Essex, and obtained the benefice of Wilton, in Wiltshire. He afterwards fled to Holland. B. Brook's *Lives of the Puritans*, ii. 237–240. 1813.

petitioning the Parliament against the Anglican hierarchy; he was an eager advocate for the Presbyterianizing of the English Church, and even joined in forming a secret 'classis.'[1] In his first attack upon the Separatist Independents he not only proved them to be 'schismatics,' judged from the Nonconformist standpoint, but told them that they were making 'a vile schism, rending themselves from the Church of England, and condemning by their assertions the whole visible Church in the world;' he predicted that 'the end of Brownism,' as Congregationalist Separation from the historical Church was then called, would be 'infinite schisms,'[2] a prediction which was fully realized fifty years afterwards. The Nonconformist Richard Bernard charged the Separatists with being 'guilty of an uncharitable and lewd schism.[3] It would be easy to heap up hundredfold proofs that every Nonconformist, prior to the fight between the Nonconformists and the 'Dissenters' in the Westminster Assembly, regarded every Independent and Baptist as a schismatic. After the Parliament had expelled the National episcopate and abolished the Catholic ceremonial, the Nonconformists bore witness that they still maintained their traditional attitude against the Separatists by republishing in the hour of their great triumph the common testimony against schism which they had compiled in the hour of their distress. 'Because we have a true Church, consisting of a lawful ministry and a faithful people, therefore they cannot separate themselves from us but they must needs incur the most shameful and odious reproach of manifest schism.' And again, 'We hold them all to be in a dangerous estate—we are loth to say in a damnable estate—as long as they continue in this schism.'[4] After the partial

[1] Giffard called himself, and was called by his contemporaries, 'a Nonconformist.' Cf. Stillingfleet's reference, *Unreason of Sep.* 28–30. But Hanbury, having the controversial needs of Liberationism in view, always refuses to call him (Giffard) Nonconformist, and labels him 'a Puritan Conformist,' 'a Puritan,' and 'a Conformist though a Puritan' (i. 49, 69, &c.) Hanbury infers that Giffard 'assaulted the Separatists with licence and protection derived from his position as a Conformist.'

[2] *A Short Treatise against the Donatists of England, whom we call Brownists,* 1590. In 1591 Giffard published *A Plain Declaration that our Brownists be full Donatists, by comparing them together, from point to point, out of the writings of Augustin.*

[3] *A Justification of Separation from the Church of England* (4to. 1610). The huge treatise by John Robinson, the second founder of Independency, was a reply to R. Bernard's *Christian Advertisements; Dissuasions from the Separatists' Schism.*

[4] *A most Grave and Modest Confutation of the Errors of the Sect called Brownists or Separatists, agreed upon long since by the joint con-*

establishment of Nonconformist Presbyterianism in the city of London, the 'ministers and elders' met together in a 'Provincial Assembly' in November 1649, and drew up an exceedingly long joint appeal to all classes of their parishioners.[1] The Independents refused to communicate with the Presbyterianized Churches, on the two grounds that the parochial congregations were not rightly gathered and organized, and that the parochial ministers had not renounced the anti-Christian ordination which they had received from the bishops.

'You rend yourselves from us,' said the Nonconformist rectors and vicars to the Separatists, 'with a dislike of us, and a protestation that you cannot join with us as fixed members without sin. You renounce all Church communion with us as members; and not only so, but you invite your people from us by telling them that they cannot continue with us without sin. You gather "Churches" out of our Churches, and you set up "Churches" in an opposite way to our Churches. May not your secession be properly called schism?' 'Godly and learned *Nonconformists* of this last age,' they added, 'even then, when our Churches were full of sinful mixtures, with great zeal and learning defended them, so far as to write against them that did separate from them' (pp. 129, 130).

After the restoration of the episcopate in 1660, the Nonconformist ministers complained to Charles II. that it was charged against them 'that the Nonconformists were the cause of separation.' They reminded the King that the very contrary was true, for that 'they were those who did most against it.'[2]

It is evident enough from the citations which we have given, to which we could readily add hundreds equally strong, that the Nonconformist fathers and confessors, whose names are invoked in the Vatican of Liberationism in Farringdon Street, would one and all without hesitation have pronounced —nay, that the Nonconformist fathers and confessors, though dead yet speaking, do now pronounce—Dr. Allon, Mr. Rogers, Mr. Dale, Mr. Kennedy, and all the Jubilee lecturers to be 'schismatics' because they are separatists from the Church of England. We do not like to call any man by any name which is disagreeable to him. We have not called these gentlemen 'schismatics;' we have simply demonstrated that those who now call themselves Nonconformists would have been disowned by the historical Nonconformists, and that

sent of many Ministers then standing out in the cause of Inconformity, 1644, p. 57; Preface to the Reader, p. 17.

[1] *A Vindication of the Presbyterial Government and Ministry*, 4to. 1650, p. 175. There is a MS. copy in Sion College Library.

[2] *Defence of the Proposals*, in *Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, pp. 248–258.

'schismatics' or 'Separatists' are the names by which the genuine Nonconformists would have called them. If Mr. Rogers or the Right Hon. Mr. Bright really want to become Nonconformists, it is plain that they must cease to be Separatists. When a modern Dissenter from the National Church is indignant because he is called 'a schismatic' or 'a sectary,' he ought to remember that these are exactly the names by which the old Nonconformists, whom he ignorantly worships, and whose title he has appropriated, would undoubtedly have called him.

IV.

We are far from charging our modern Separatists with conscious fraud, as Mr. Rogers supposes, when we charge them with wrongly assuming the title and honours of the Nonconformists. Now, as in the days of Thomas Cartwright and Robert Brown, although Nonconformity and Separatism are two quite distinct things, they have their points of affinity as well as of repulsion. When the early Separatist Independents published from their prison their four reasons for schism from the National Church, they took three of these reasons—the false ministry, false government, and false worship of 'the parish assemblies called the Church of England'—from the famous 'Admonition to the Parliament' which had been published by the Nonconformists.[1] Yet they renounced the fundamental principle of Nonconformity, which held back the Nonconformists from developing into Separatists—namely, that the Church of England, notwithstanding its prelatical and ritual corruptions, was the one and only true Church of God in the land. Archbishop Whitgift knew that the Nonconformists were no Separatists. Hence he desired his old opponent Thomas Cartwright, the leader of the Nonconformists, who was himself in prison for Nonconformity, to confer with Barrowe and other imprisoned Separatists. The enmity betwixt the Nonconformist and Separatist leaders was so intense that Cartwright flatly refused to have a second personal conference with Barrowe. To the Conformist theologians—the famous Andrewes, Parry, Bisse, and White—whom the Archbishop 'sent unto him to counsel him for his soul's health,' Barrowe observed—

'You are not the men whom I most dislike in these differences; for although you be out of the way, yet you think you are in the right. But I cannot but complain of Master Cartwright and others

[1] *A Plain Refutation of Mr. Giffard's book*, republished in 1605, with a dedication to Cecil, 4to. pp. 260.

of his knowledge (from whom we have received the truth of these things, and have been taught that your callings are anti-Christian) who will not come out of Babylon for fear of their lives.'[1]

When Dr. Ravis, afterwards Bishop of London, informed the sturdy martyrs of Independency that his Nonconformist fellow-prisoner refused to see him, Barrowe fetched a great sigh, saying, 'Will he not? He only brought me into this brake, and will he now leave me? For from him I received my grounds, and out of his premises did I infer and make the conclusions which I now hold, and for which I suffer.'[2] The points of distinction and opposition between the Nonconformist or Puritan and the Separatist or Dissenter have by no one been so elaborately worked as by John Canne.[3] Canne's argument against the Nonconformists is the same as Barrowe's, the same as King James's—that 'the Puritans are the founders and fathers of the Brownists.' This position was accepted by all Separatists, and by many Conformists, as unanswerable.[4] The Separatists contended that 'the godly people of England,' as John Robinson flatteringly called his Nonconformist opponents, to distinguish them from their Conformist fellow-Churchmen, if they were logical, if they were faithful to their own principles, must infallibly cease to be Nonconformists inside the Anglican Babylon, and flee into a Separatist Congregational, Anabaptist, or other sectarian Sion

[1] A similar testimony that some of the Independent Separatists still preferred Conformists to Nonconformists was given by the 'Provincial Assembly of November 1649, after Conformity had been made illegal. 'Are there not some of you that choose rather to join with Anabaptists and episcopal men than with us?'—*A Vindication of the Presbyterial Government and Ministry*, 1650, p. 137.

[2] The Nonconformist leader and the Separatist leader were both in the Fleet. *The Life of John Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury*, by Sir G. Paule, comptroller of his Grace's household. Ed. 1699, pp. 66, 67.

[3] *A Necessity of Separation* (v. s.) Canne's latest editor, the Rev. C. Stovel, has the rare honesty to confess that 'the Nonconformists and the High Church party,' widely as they differed, agreed in their opposition to Separatism or Dissent (vii.) He holds, as a Baptist, that Conformity and Nonconformity are both wrongful attitudes, and that 'the separation Canne urges is as needful and obligatory now as it was at any former period' (v.)

[4] The Conformist Dr. Burgess, in his controversy with the Nonconformist Dr. Ames, said that he agreed with Bishop Morton that 'those who will not conform to our ceremonies do teach the principles of Separation.' 'Out of your school of contradiction,' he added, 'the Separatists have taken their principles of Separation.' Again, 'I am and have ever been of that opinion, that there can be no just confutation of the Separatists made by such of the Nonconformists as have given them their main principles.'—*Answer to a Pamphlet* (v.s.), 1631, p. 238.

outside it. Mr. Rogers accepts this position. 'Congregationalism,' he says, 'is the legitimate development of the principles of Puritanism'[1]—he will not say of 'Nonconformity,' lest his readers should see that the proper meaning of Nonconformity was Anti-Congregationalism. But Congregationalism can only claim to be a development of a less important element of 'the principles of Puritanism;' while it involves now, as it was perceived by the old Nonconformists to involve in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, a deliberate violation of the root principle of Puritanism or Nonconformity—namely, that separation from the Church, on the plea of its corruptions, and the gathering of 'Churches' outside the Church of England, and in opposition to it, is schism. The Nonconformists consistently refused to see the force of the Separatist argument. They were a Church *party*, while the Separatists were an anti-Church *sect*. The original germ of every sect which has ultimately organized itself outside the Church, and in opposition to it, may always be detected by the scientific historian in some party within the Church, which intended to remain within the Church, but to reform it. It was so with all those known as Nonconformists in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and it was so with the Methodist Nonconformists of the eighteenth century. The sect, however, never understands nor accepts the entire tradition of the Church-party to which it has most similarity. If it develops some principles of the party, it renounces other principles. There was a truce, but no true alliance, between the Nonconformists and a few of the Separatists in the early days of the Long Parliament. The party and the sect were both eager, as Robert Baillie wrote in 1641, to be 'rid of the Bishops. Till then,' he naively adds, 'we have agreed to to say nothing of anything wherein we differ.' 'We,' said the Nonconformists to the Separatists, in their appeal of November 1649, 'dare not make a separation *from* a true Church by departing from it as you do. Yet we do make a separation *in* a true Church by purging and reforming, which you do not.'[2] Hence thoroughgoing Separatists like Barrowe and Mr. Rogers naturally wonder how enlightened and godly men, like Cartwright and Dean Close, can remain in a Church which embraces a Whitgift and a Pusey. 'The Separatists,' says Mr. Rogers, 'had just reason to complain of them.' By 'them' he means the Nonconformists, though

[1] *Jubilee Lectures*, ii. 215.
[2] *A Vindication*, &c. (v. s.), p. 133.

he will not use the word in such a position. 'For,' he goes on, 'by refusing to apply the principles they [the Nonconformists] had laid down they strengthened the forces of the clericalism or Catholicism against which both alike [the Nonconformists and Separatists] had to contend.' The forces against which the Nonconformists all along contended were prelatical Conformity and dissenting Separatism; the forces against which the Separatists contended were Conformity and Nonconformity. The Nonconformists were undoubtedly anti-sacerdotal, but never anti-clerical. They were the most vehement upholders of 'clericalism' who have ever used the English tongue. It was one of the most frequent charges brought against them by the Separatists. Mr. Rogers probably fancies that Milton was an Independent or Separatist. He might have remembered Milton's saying that the Nonconformist 'new presbyter' was the Conformist 'old priest writ large.' It was not the Sacerdotalist, it was the ultra-clericalist Nonconformist, who denied the validity of baptism by a layman. 'On this point, whether he (the baptizer) be a minister or not,' said Cartwright, 'dependeth not only the dignity, but also the being of the Sacrament.' He added, 'We have the consent of the Reformed Churches [the foreign ideal of the English Nonconformist] against the baptism by private men.'[1]

If the Jubilee lecturers and other Separatists choose to call themselves 'Nonconformists,' they ought to explain that they use the term in a meaning precisely opposite to its historical meaning. If they choose to call the old Nonconformists the fathers—or 'grandfathers,' as Mr. Rogers now proposes—of the modern Separatists, it is due to the memory, to the witness, to the sufferings, of men like Thomas Cartwright and Richard Baxter, to explain that they consistently refused the title of Separatists and hated and opposed the thing. Every *party* within a Church, while it aims at reforming or transforming the whole of that Church into correspondence with its own ideal plan, is in a certain degree of subjective *dissent* from all those other members of that Church who oppose its aims. So we might as reasonably call Pusey and Keble, and Arnold and Stanley 'Dissenters,' as call Mr. Spurgeon and Mr. Bright 'Nonconformists.' Baxter, in the midst of his fervent asseveration that he and his fellow-Nonconformists are foes of separation from the Church, and ask only for comprehension

[1] Cf. Hooker's fine defence of lay baptism against Cartwright and the Nonconformists, *Eccl. Pol.* v. 62.

within it, speaks of 'our dissent.'[1] It is plain that the meaning of the term is subjective, and that Baxter's 'dissent' was the clear contrary to that objective dissent which shows itself not in the form of a Church party, but of an anti-Church sect. Mr. Rogers contends that 'if the Puritans' (he is again afraid to call them 'the Nonconformists') 'were not the fathers, they were at least the grandfathers of modern Dissent;'[2] and he seems to think this to be a sufficient reason why modern Separatists have a right to call themselves 'Nonconformists' rather than 'Dissenters.' He does no honour to the fathers of Congregationalist Dissent by making this claim of affinity with their hereditary foes. John Robinson, the ablest of all the Independents, and the most venerated, denied that there was the least degree of kinship between the Nonconformist party and the Congregationalist sect. Robinson had, indeed, called the Nonconformists the 'godly' minority in the English Church, but he would not allow that they had on account of their 'godly' character any place 'in the family and household of God.' He declared that the Separatist would not own any Nonconformist as a brother, so long as he remained merely a Nonconformist—the member of a party or 'faction' within the apostate Church of England. 'We cannot acknowledge some of you as brethren,' says this Separatist to his 'grandfathers' the Nonconformists, 'but we must acknowledge all amongst you for such; for there is but one brotherhood of all amongst you.' He calls the Conformist 'brother priest, brother dumb priest,' and calls the Nonconformist 'brother half-priest.' Whitgift and Cartwright, Laud and his opponent Leighton, belonged to one and the same Church as ministers, and if the Separatists owned the kinship of the one they must own the kinship of the other. Hence the Separatist Robinson consistently said to Bernard, his Nonconformist opponent, 'Disclaim you the fatherhood of the prelates, the brotherhood of the unhallowed multitude [the whole Catholic Church on earth], and feast yourselves in the family and household of God [the new English sect of Congregational Independency]—and we will acknowledge you in word and deed.'[3] The Separatists began by excommunicating the Nonconformists, as Bishop Grindal has shown us, and Robinson was faithful to their tradition. Illiberal and narrow as Non-

[1] *The Nonconformists' Plea*, 1679 (Epistle, p. v.)

[2] *Jubilee Lectures*, ii. 215.

[3] *A Justification of Separation*]*from the Church of England, against Mr. Richard Bernard, his invective intituled 'The Separatists' Schism,'* 4to, 1610, pp. 104, 105.

conformity was in comparison with the 'Prelatic and Arminian party' in the Church, it was much too liberal and too wide for the Independent Separatists. Robinson accuses his Nonconformist adversary of owning even 'the fraternity of a recusant Papist, if not living yet dead; for so you bury him, as your dear brother, committing his soul to God and his body to the earth.'

We have shown that the modern Liberationists resort to a novel and unhistorical nomenclature in order to hide the fact that the Nonconformists were not Separatists, but anti-Separatists. We have shown that the relation between the Nonconformist and the Dissenter was such as frequently exists between a party in the Church and a sect outside the Church. We hope on a future occasion to trace the history of the word 'Dissenter,' which succeeded the word 'Separatist,' and to show that the passage out of Nonconformity into Separation is first definitively made by the deliberate *ordination* of a ministry distinct from that which is already ordained in the Catholic, National, and Parochial Church. We also hope to examine the plea of the modern Separatist, that if he has no direct historical right, he has a vague etymological title, to call himself the successor of the ejected anti-Separatists of 1662.

ART. IX.—THE CATHOLIC SIDE OF ANGLICANISM.

1. *Eighteen Centuries of the Church in England.* By the Rev. A. H. HORE, M.A. (London, 1881.)
2. *Life of the Right Rev. Samuel Wilberforce, D.D.* Three vols. Vol. I. by the Rev. Canon ASHWELL; Vols. II. and III. by his son, REGINALD G. WILBERFORCE. (London, 1880–1882.)
3. *Annals of the Tractarian Movement.* By EDWARD GEORGE KIRWAN BROWNE. (London, 1861.)
4. *The Bystander: a Quarterly Review.* (Toronto, April 1883.)

THE question which has been raised in our own day, through the agency of protracted litigation, whether the Catholic or the Protestant, the High Church or the Low Church, element in the Church of England is that which most truly represents

the mind and the purpose of that body, is in no sense a new one. It is in truth the one matter of debate and struggle from the death of Henry VIII. to the restoration of Charles II. The chief difference noticeable is that in the present day the issue has been fought out in the main on its merits, and has been only so far complicated with political interests that the Privy Council judgments concerned are acknowledged by all, except those who have a polemical motive in upholding them, to have been framed with entire disregard of the legal bearings of the cases before the Court, and to have represented only an opinion as to public expediency, coloured and moulded by the theological bias of the Chancellor for the time being.

Consequently, it is possible to view the question more clearly than when enveloped in the smoke of battle between Cavalier and Roundhead, or even during the earlier conflict between the Old and the New Learning. The Evangelical school of the present day, however, both here and in the daughter Church of the United States, has committed the grave strategical error (never imitated by its competitor) of striking for monopoly, not for co-ordinate position, and thus, so far as it is concerned, has staked its all on its claim to be the only lawful tenant. That is the meaning of the war carried on with extraordinary persistence and craft by the late Bishop M'Ilvaine of Ohio against the High Church school in America, though for at least thirty-five out of his forty years' episcopate it had never advanced beyond the level of decorous Anglicanism. And it is also the meaning of the policy of the Church Association. True, that body was titularly called into existence by the rise of the movement now currently known as Ritualism, and thus has a surface aspect of mere defensiveness, but it was organized by the very men who had been for thirty years before, in person or by their sympathizers, endeavouring to oust that 'old historical High Church party' to which it now pays court in the pages of the *Quarterly Review*, not less than in the columns of the *Record*, urging it to make common cause with Exeter Hall, and to join in expelling the Ritualists as the disturbers of the common peace and weal.

And the result, so far, has been here and in America disastrous rout and failure on the Puritan side. In both places the advantage was considerably on the side of the assailants. In the United States a variety of causes had led to the practical administration of most Church organizations and undertakings through the agency of societies, rather than through the regular synods and courts. And in these socie-

ties the Evangelical school, which has always shown considerable aptitude for the processes of electioneering, had secured entire preponderance, and the virtual control, in most cases, of the decision of the House of Bishops. Thus it had all the influence of possession, and it was bent on making its supremacy permanent and unquestioned. It did not disguise from itself for a moment that strong means would have to be used for the purpose, and it was not at all chary of employing them. It entered on the conflict with a light heart, and perfect confidence of victory, and issued from it so entirely defeated that the extreme left wing seceded and formed a new communion—that known as the Cumminsite sect, or Reformed Episcopalians, which has a small offshoot in this country. The true origin of this body was indiscreetly disclosed by Mr. Nicholson, one of its leading members, and later, if we do not mistake, a bishop in the society. He published a letter explaining the motives of his secession, in which he made no assertion of any ill-treatment inflicted upon or apprehended by his school, but simply appealed to the notorious spread of doctrines and practices distasteful to that school, and the impossibility of suppressing or even checking them. He replied to the objection, 'Why not remain in the Church, and fight the question there, instead of going outside?' by saying that the question had already been so fought, with the result of total defeat for the Low Church school; and the certainty that this must continue to be so, because the language of the Prayer Book is so entirely in favour of High Church views, that wherever it is employed as a manual of instruction, nothing is easier than for High Churchmen not only to appeal to it in their own behalf, but to argue that their competitors are out of harmony with it. And accordingly the Prayer Book, as remodelled by the sect for its own use, is the mere ghost of its former self, and bears a curious likeness, in a number of its alterations, to the Unitarian revision published by the late Mr. Pickering in 1852.

The event of battle has been precisely the same in England. While it is true that the Evangelical school had not acquired the same control of the Church in general as in the United States, still they were a very powerful, compact, and wealthy body, not only enjoying absolute impunity for anything they might choose to say and do in or out of church, but having the great majority of the bishops, even such as professed themselves in some sense High Churchmen, as their firm allies against the Oxford movement, whether in its

earlier Tractarian or its later Ritualistic phase. Those who are curious in the history of the movement may consult with advantage Mr. Bricknell's volume, *The Judgment of the Bishops on Tractarian Theology*, issued so far back as 1845, which proves that there was no such tenderness felt then for the new reformers, before their tenets began to be translated into visible action, as might be fancied by persons who are acquainted only with more recent episcopal allocutions. And in particular Sumner, Longley, and Tait, Archbishops of Canterbury, sitting from 1848 to 1882, and Musgrave, Longley, and Thomson, Archbishops of York, during the same period, were its steady and persistent foes, the last-named prelate being still its most embittered opponent. The whole influence of the Court was also thrown into the scale against it, and nearly all that of the secular press. And above all, it drew upon itself the determined hostility of the lawyers, who have always in this country been jealous and distrustful of the Church, as a body governed by laws and courts unfamiliar to the ordinary legal practitioner, diverse in origin, in character, and in sanction from the only jurisprudence with which they are accustomed to deal. Hence the bias of English lawyers, as a class, has invariably been hostile to whatever is distinctively Church-like in character, quite apart from doctrinal issues. Thus the evil of simony, as now practised, is wholly the creation of lawyers, and to them is due also the all but impossibility of ridding the Church of dissolute clergymen, because they have insisted, in both these cases, on treating an ecclesiastical benefice as a piece of property held for the private advantage of the incumbent, rather than as a trust for the public, subject to forfeiture on any reasonable proof of malversation. So too, they have managed to bring the law of marriage in this country into direct conflict with the Gospel and with the interests of society. Accordingly, it is no matter of surprise to note that, when doctrinal and ceremonial questions have come before them, their tendency has always been to rule in favour of Broad Church and Low Church, and against High Church, simply as recognizing that the first and second are in truth only titular Churchmen, in no sense truly representative of the entity which lawyers dread and hate so cordially; while its real champions are to be found amongst the third alone, as the one section which cares for the independence of the spiritualty, and is ready to resist encroachments of the temporalty on its domain. This is a large factor in the genesis of the notorious series of Privy Council judgments beginning

with the Gorham finding in 1850, which has been for the most part overlooked, even by their severest censors. When to all this is added the conservative temper of the average Englishman, and the traditional horror of Popery, readily chargeable on men of the High Church section, and given an air of certainty by the number of eminent seceders from its ranks in 1844–5 and 1850–1, it is clear that every chance was against the nascent school. No shrewd man of the world, if asked to forecast its prospects at either of those periods, would have hesitated to predict its collapse within a very short time. But it is now confessed on all hands that it (and it only) has succeeded in wholly transforming the outward aspect—nay, much more, the inner temper—of the Church of England; and the cleverest members of the school which has most hotly opposed it have now been driven to confess that the future of their own party depends on their having the wisdom to copy some of the very methods which have been the subject of their fervid denunciation for a quarter of a century past.

There is a yet more striking aspect of the matter, visible alike here and in America. It is that this revolution, which has been represented in many quarters as a mere recrudescence of mediæval superstition, allying itself with the taste for luxury and costliness rife in the present day, instead of creating or fostering a reaction against the Church, and in favour of competing Protestant bodies, has been attended, here and in America, with a revival of the influence of the Church, not only within its own pale and on its own members, but upon outsiders to its communion, which has absolutely no parallel in ecclesiastical history. This is all the more remarkable in America, because the Episcopalian body has less share than any of its local coevals in the political memories of the War of Independence, since it was mainly Royalist then; while the intellectual pre-eminence among the religious bodies of America was long viewed as the chartered possession of the Unitarians of Boston. But the Church in the United States, far surpassed as it is in numbers and wealth by various sects (which had full power of expanding themselves during all that long time when English statesmen and prelates denied a local episcopate to the colonies), has steadily risen to the first place in public esteem, to the chief position of social influence, and to an attractive power which enables it, unestablished and all but unendowed, to draw into its ministry, year by year, the very flower of the sectarian pastorate, besides growing at a pace considerably

faster than any other denomination. One testimony out of many may here be cited. Professor Hopkins, of the Presbyterian Seminary at Auburn (N. Y.), in a recent article advising the adoption of a liturgical worship, remarks :—

'A very large number of the children of Presbyterian families, and many of the cultivated and tasteful of our members, have sought a more cheerful, more varied, more sympathetic service in another communion. There is not a Presbyterian pastor in the land but can testify to such losses. The Anglican Church has been largely recruited from our ranks. There are many thousands in that Church at present who have been drawn away merely by the superior attractions of its *cultus*. Certainly they have not been enticed by the greater impressiveness or eloquence of the pulpit. . . . The tracks are all one way. Look through any circle of your own acquaintanceship, and count up the Presbyterian families in which one, two, or more lambs have strayed into the Bishop's fold. . . . It is very largely due to this fact that, of all the sects in the United States, the Anglican is growing the most rapidly at the present time. It is forming new congregations and organizing new dioceses with extraordinary rapidity. On the other hand, the Presbyterian Church is almost stationary. It requires a close calculation to show that she is even holding her own.'

With us, in this country, the case has been epigrammatically worded by the *Pall Mall Gazette*, which no one will suspect of sacerdotal tendencies, that 'the Ritualists have made the Church of England interesting;' and no one seriously denies that it is stronger in public respect and in practical activity now than at any time since the fourteenth century. That such a phenomenon should be repeated on both sides of the Atlantic, under such wholly different conditions, agreeing only in the one point of the revival being a High Church process, attended by the virtual overthrow of the Low Church school, goes a long way towards answering the question stated at the beginning of this paper.[1]

But the matter will become clearer if we bring some additional factors into the inquiry. The recently disestablished Church of Ireland has consistently upheld the Protestant, as opposed to the Catholic, interpretation of the formularies, and has accommodated its practice to that interpretation, for the last three hundred years, and has also been for the greater part of that time engaged in a practical, not a mere literary, contest with Roman Catholicism, having extraor-

[1] One piece of statistics will serve to show the strength of one of the minor currents. The sale of *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, issued first in 1861, and steadily opposed from then till now by the Puritan school, has exceeded twenty-four millions of copies.

dinary advantages on its side, legal, social, and economic, to aid it in the struggle. Nevertheless it has not only made no impression whatever on the popular religion, but it is the only considerable communion in Ireland which is shown, by the religious statistics of several successive census periods, to have steadily lost ground in its ratio to the population—a phenomenon by no means limited to the years since disestablishment, and therefore not to be set down to that measure. Again, when we look at the Colonial Churches in communion with the Church of England, the same fact meets us everywhere, that where an Evangelical bishop, as in Sydney and Melbourne, has been for any long time in office, and has had the opportunity of giving predominance to his own school amongst the clergy, there the Anglican Church is feeble and unrespected, and is far surpassed in popularity and in energy by one or more of the sects; while the converse holds of High Church dioceses, like Bloemfontein.

It is not easy, then, to believe that the method which fails always and everywhere in the present day can be the true exponent of Church of Englandism, while that which succeeds is the mere exotic importation of a few antiquaries and crotcheteers. But when we search the records of past history, we are met by some facts even more remarkable. There have been two occasions since the actual crisis of the Reformation when the Low Church school obtained practical control of the religious energies within the Anglican body; the High Church school had the like chance once, and the Broad Church party once also. The two periods of Low Church preponderance were from the accession of Grindal to the Primacy in 1575 till the death of Abbot in 1633, and, somewhat roughly speaking, the reigns of George III. and George IV., since the 'Evangelical Revival,' begun by Methodism, had taken a firm hold on a section of Anglican clergymen just before the death of George II. And, though little countenanced by those in authority, this section undoubtedly was the most active and influential one in the Church during that second period. The High Church time of influence was confined to the reigns of Charles II. and James II., though the school had a partial gleam of prosperity (rather political, however, than ecclesiastical) under Anne. The Broad Church innings lasted, with a slight check under Queen Anne, from the Revolution of 1688 till the death of George II.

What, then, were the results of these administrations severally?

The first Low Church moulding of the Church of England

issued in the entire overthrow of the Anglican polity, the abolition of episcopacy, the penal prohibition of the Book of Common Prayer, and the expulsion of seven thousand incumbents from their benefices, not a few of whom were subjected to other and severer penalties, inclusive of being sold as slaves to the plantations.

Stop a little, interpolates an objector. Is it not rather the High Church school, as represented by Laud and his accomplices, with their ritualistic excesses and their overweening sacerdotalism, who are notoriously accountable for inviting and precipitating this ruin? Is it not a clear falsification of history to lay the blame on the men who would have checked his mad career if possible?

Not in the least. The movement under Laud, in the first place, was to a very small extent either sacerdotalist or ritualistic. It was anti-Calvinist, and it aimed at securing a moderate degree of conformity to the Prayer Book, nothing nearly so close as is found in even the laxest Evangelical parishes nowadays. But Laud made a point of only one piece of ritualism, which was the placing and fencing the altar in the way which is practically universal now, and that in order to put a stop to very gross profanity, then more than common. The ceremonial revival was very sparse and partial, and the whole body of those who took part in it formed a much smaller minority of the clergy than what are called 'extreme Ritualists' do now. Next, Laud's reforms did not originate spontaneously from below. They were pressed on by authority from above, and were regarded with unconcealed dislike by most of those affected by them. Low Churchism was the prevalent tone of opinion, outside the small cluster of dignitaries and of teachers in the University of Oxford, as transformed by Laud from the Calvinistic hotbed it was when he went thither in 1590. A High Church school was doubtless rising, but the tradition of sixty years was against it. Consequently, what we are entitled to expect, if the Low Church party had really been attached to and fairly representative of the Church of England, is that there would have been a simple repudiation of Laud and his school, perhaps the expulsion of a sufficient number of them to deter the remainder, and the final settlement of the debate on the general lines of the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. That is to say, the Church would have come out of the conflict as a definitely Puritan body, but still retaining its mode of government and the form of its public worship, somewhat modified, precisely as has happened in the Irish Church of our own day. But

nothing of the sort occurred. Entire destruction of the whole constitution of the Church, not any partial reform in the Puritan direction, was the outcome of the matter, and the fact proves incontestably that the Low Church clergy had not succeeded, if they ever tried, in conciliating good-will towards the communion to which they titularly belonged.

To this first period of Low Church influence the High Church *régime* is next in order. What did it effect? In the first place, it made that settlement of the Prayer Book and polity of the Church which has lasted ever since. There may be reasonable doubts as to this or that detail, but every publicist and intelligent thinker must acknowledge that a system which has worked fairly well, under all sorts of trials and conditions, for more than two hundred years, must have remarkable merits, and that its framers are entitled to high credit. Next, it all but extirpated Dissent by entirely peaceful means—the invidious Acts of Charles II.'s Parliaments directed against Nonconformists were purely civil and political, and were repealed under William III.—so that when the eighteenth century began Dissent was confined to about four per cent. of the nation.

The Broad Church school attained dominance under William III., and though Queen Anne was personally in favour of the High Church school, yet Tenison, Primate during the whole of her reign, carried on the traditions of his latitudinarian predecessor, the intruder Tillotson; and nine other Whig prelates (including Sharp, Archbishop of York) also continued in their sees during all but the same time, without counting those who lived for some years of it only. Thus there was no possibility of any corporate and official action in the High Church direction at that period; and the bent in the Broad Church direction, already given at the Revolution, was confirmed at the accession of the House of Hanover, especially during the long tenure of power by Sir Robert Walpole. All are agreed as to the result. No such time of moral and spiritual coldness and decay, of pastoral apathy and neglect, of rampant irreligion, of jobs, abuses, and scandals of all kinds in the Church of England, as the Broad Church *régime* has been known since its foundation, not even in the darkest days of the fifteenth century.

When Wesley arose to put new life into English religion, the Church had drifted too far for recovery just then, and so his influence, and that of Whitefield, passed out of the pale of the Establishment, and became virtually a Dissenting energy. It is not now the time to apportion the blame of

this misfortune (which is not all chargeable on the authorities of the Church), and it must suffice to record the bare fact. However, that section of the clergy which had embraced the theological principles of Wesley and Whitefield, without accepting the rest of their position, formed what is known now as the Evangelical party in the Church, and set to work earnestly to propagate their views. What came of their enterprise, so far as the interests of the Church of England are concerned? We told the story in this *Review* exactly six years ago;[1] and it came to this, that the Evangelical leaders virtually created modern Dissent, and raised it from one-twentieth of the population, as it was when George II. came to the throne, to more than one-third and so nearly one-half, that it has been possible for living Dissenters to allege, with some show of plausibility, that they constitute an actual majority of the nation. What is more, the Evangelicals confined their work, so far as it remained inside the Church, to the single end of promoting the interests of their party, and securing a larger number of pulpits for their preachers. They did not attempt to deal with any defects or scandals in the Church at large; and after they had been the chief energizing school for seventy years, the Church of England was found, at the epoch of the Reform Bill in 1832, weak, inefficient, chaotic, and unpopular; so that its speedy overthrow was confidently looked for, and even desired, by a considerable part of the nation.

Then came the great Oxford movement, with the counteracting result we have already mentioned, that of the marvellous revival of the Church in manifold forms of vitality and energy, the abolition or mitigation of countless abuses, and the more than reinstatement of the whole body in public esteem and affection.

Hence it appears that Low Church supremacy in the Church of England has meant hitherto the substitution of a different theology and polity for that of the Church of England itself, whether better or worse does not affect the main fact; that Broad Church supremacy has meant the virtual extinction of religion; and that only the High Church policy has been compatible with or effective for the spiritual and temporal welfare of the Church.

We repeat, this teaching of experience really decides the controversy. For a living body lives and thrives by virtue of what it is and what agrees with its constitution, not by what

[1] 'The Church of England in the Eighteenth Century,' *Church Quarterly Review*, July 1877.

it is not and what manifestly hurts it. But there are minds which are incapable of taking broad and statesmanlike views of great questions, and can see only such details as will fit in with a preconceived judgment. They are numerous amongst the foes of the Church of England, and especially of that aspect of the Church of England which we hold to be the best. Of those opponents, none of late has been more redoubtable than Mr. Goldwin Smith, who has thrown himself into the conflict in the Canadian Church, where, as in all the other colonies of the empire, the issues at stake are quite as serious as they are in the home Church. The Canadian magazine which we have named at the head of this article illustrates this truth very forcibly. It is an open secret that the *Bystander* is virtually the unaided product of Mr. Goldwin Smith's erratic, if clever, pen.

In the notices of the *Life of Bishop Wilberforce* and of Mr. Mozley's *Reminiscences of Oriel*, which he has contributed to the April number of the current year, he has set himself to the congenial task of decrying the High Anglican school as a sham and a failure, and of endeavouring to show that, if it were honest and logical, it would submit to the claims of the Church of Rome. That is a very trite form of attack, and all that Mr. Smith has done is to put the case somewhat more briefly and incisively than the ordinary Puritan controversialist, rarely endowed with literary faculty, is able to do. We will abridge further the counts of the indictment, omitting nothing of weight, merely premising that Mr. Smith makes a serious mistake at the outset in representing Samuel Wilberforce as a High Anglican who floundered about trying to find a logical standing-place for his illogical party, and who would have gone to Rome, like his two brothers, if he had let his real convictions have fair play, and had not stifled them from motives more or less worldly. Now, the simple truth is that Bishop Wilberforce was never a High Churchman at all by original training or by subsequent conversion. He was bred what he continued to be more or less to the end of his life, a Church Evangelical, a type perfectly distinct from the Exeter Hall and Church Association variety, but just as clearly marked off from High Churchmen. What Wilberforce was shrewd enough to see was that the Church of England, given its liturgy and polity, could not be successfully administered on the lines of the non-Church Evangelicals, and there were not enough left of his father's school to constitute a working factor in the body, as most of that section had shaded off into the High Church ranks. He was thus forced to throw

himself into the High Church movement, but it was reluctantly, and he never accepted its theology, where that theology differed practically from what he had learnt as a child. This is the real secret of his seeming inconsistency and insincerity: that he had to work on lines which he accepted only as a less evil than those of the narrow and mainly illiterate school which monopolized that name of Evangelical which he had known associated with a very different stamp of adherents. Now to Mr. Goldwin Smith's general indictment of High Anglicanism. It is to the following effect.

It is certain, he tells us, that the High Anglican doctrines and system were not those of the Church of England for a hundred years after her separation from Rome. Episcopacy was viewed as no Divine ordinance, but an alterable matter of government, which the State might change; the English Reformers were in full communion with foreign Reformers, and held non-episcopal orders to be valid. The Thirty-nine Articles, the creed of the Established Church, are thoroughly Protestant, and are detested by High Churchmen, who make desperate attempts to prove that the Liturgy, not the Articles, is the standard of belief. The liturgy, to be sure, has some relics of Popery in it, but mere verbal points do not make a spiritual tradition. The Anglican Church sent delegates to the Calvinist Synod of Dort. The Laudian movement betrayed its true character by the number of converts it sent, like the later movement of 1833, over to Rome. The altar was not put in its present place till the reign of Charles II. Antiquity is of no use as an appeal, for everyone of any scholarship knows that episcopacy, sacerdotalism, and sacramentalism are not primitive, and cannot be traced back further than the end of the second century. And if Apostolical succession and the guardianship of the faith by bishops were true in fact, then it is monstrous to suppose that the Roman Catholic episcopate, who constitute the vast majority of Christian bishops, should be in error, and the truth rest with the tiny group of Anglican prelates, belonging to the Church of a single nation, and that divided against itself. And as to ritualism, it is nothing but a taste for ceremonial and the feminine craving for a spiritual director. That is the case for the prosecution, and we have not left out any point of importance.

The first criticism to make is Galileo's, 'E pur si muove.' If this account of the matter is the whole of it, then the broad historical facts we have just set down are simply inexplicable. A wholly erroneous and factitious religious system may live

and even thrive, but it must be in some kind of harmony with its environment to do so. If a school were to arise amongst the Baptists which taught the absolute necessity and Divine warrant of infant baptism, that school must either secede or destroy the Baptist sect, whose fundamental principle is anti-pædobaptism. It is simply inconceivable that it could not only continue within that body, but that its doing so should revive and strengthen the body itself, exactly in proportion as it admitted the new teaching and the consequent practice. Mohammedanism thrives as a missionary agency in Africa, but that is because it is just far enough above the indigenous beliefs to be easy of acceptance by Negroes, while raising them some degrees in civilization and creed. It could not hope for a like success in Europe or North America. And so too the bare fact that High Anglicanism succeeds in the Church of England proves that there is at least a natural affinity for it there, and that it is not a mere alien and casual intrusion.

But that is a very inadequate statement of the case. It is to be observed that Mr. Smith faithfully copies the fallacy of taking a single point in a long and intricate history, and arguing as if that made the whole of it. He does not attempt to deal with the Church of England before the reign of Elizabeth or after that of James I. Now, the Church of England to-day is the Church as it finally emerged in 1662 from the two-century-old Reformation conflict; not as it was a hundred years before 1662, while still in a state of flux. Anyone could see the disingenuousness of alleging that Arianism is a legitimate form of belief within the Christian Church now, because nearly the whole fourth century saw it in high ecclesiastical places, and dislodged with infinite difficulty. And so, too, it would be held absurd to allege that Roman Catholics are now at liberty to recognize two or three Popes at a time, because in the fourteenth century that phenomenon occurred, and no one can tell now which Pontiffs had the best title. For all practical purposes it does not matter a straw to us what the Elizabethan bishops thought or did, and Mr. Goldwin Smith knows it perfectly well. But we have no objection to take him on this theory, and to show that he has misrepresented nearly every fact he has referred to. We shall be obliged to go to some extent over the same ground as we did some years back, when refuting the similar positions of a writer in the *Quarterly Review*.[1]

[1] Article 'Is the Church of England Protestant?' *Church Quarterly Review*, January 1879.

In the first place, it is to be remembered that the reforming movement in England began and had made some considerable progress before any thought of separation from Latin Christendom, as distinguished from the Roman Curia, had occurred to anyone in authority. Next, the Zwinglo-Calvinist faction which seized the Government under Edward VI. was a small and detested minority in both the Church and the nation (Paget writes to Somerset that eleven-twelfths of the people were against it),[1] and owed its partial rehabilitation to Mary's impolitic cruelty. Thirdly, the policy of Elizabeth at her accession was that of comprehensiveness, so as to minimize the risk of nonconformity in either the Roman or the Genevan direction; while out of the 9,400 clergy who had officiated with the Latin rite under her sister, only 189 refused to conform to the Prayer Book. It is not only incredible that the remaining 9,211 can have had any strong Puritan bias, but the very fact that no man of genius, or even of personal eminence for any quality, is to be found amongst the English Reformers, is the warrant, as well as the reason, for a much smaller measure of change in doctrine and polity having taken place here, than where a Luther, a Calvin, or a Knox directed the course of the revolution. But the extreme Calvinists who were promoted to high office by the influence of Walsingham and Leicester filled up the places of the elder clergy, as they died off, with men of their own school, and thus artificially imported from without into the Church that Calvinism which they did not find natural within it. Next, whatever the private opinions of the later Tudor bishops and clergy may have been as to the abstract validity of non-episcopal ordination, the plain legal fact is that such ordination was always insufficient as a legal and canonical qualification for holding an English benefice or ministering in an English church. We do not deny that there were undoubtedly persons with only Presbyterian orders intruded into Anglican livings, probably with connivance from some of the bishops, during Elizabeth's reign, and even James I.'s; but we state that the law of Church and State alike made such intrusion unlawful, as barred alike by the Preface to the Ordinal and by sundry canons enacted under Elizabeth. Nor can more than three or four cases be actually tested, not one of which can be shown to have had legal sanction; while in the most remarkable one of all, that of Whittingham, Dean of Durham, a suit was brought to oust

[1] Strype, *Records*, ii. 110.

him from the deanery, on the ground that he was a mere layman, as having only Presbyterian orders; and he acknowledged to the Commission of Inquiry that he was 'neither deacon nor minister according to the law of the land,' though he denied being a mere layman. His death terminated the proceedings; but Archbishop Whitgift, a sympathizer with his Calvinistic doctrine, has left on record his belief that Whittingham would have been deprived unless a special dispensation had been procured in his favour.[1]

Nor is there the slightest evidence of any formal acts of intercommunion between the English Church and the foreign Reformed bodies of the time. Of course there may very probably have been private and unofficial vagaries of the kind, such as Deans Alford and Payne Smith were pleased to take part in a few years ago; but that is not what Mr. Goldwin Smith implies; nor will his case be helped by proving that from political motives the English Government threw its influence into the scale of the insurgents against the temporal head of Romanism at that era, Philip II. of Spain. Indeed, his reference to the English delegates at the Synod of Dort reminds us that this event belongs to the category of civil politics, not of ecclesiastical polity. It is the only instance of the kind in history, and the four English deputies were sent to Dort, not by any Church authority, nor for any spiritual purpose, but by King James I. for political objects. If they had been sent for a religious end, that must have been the agreeing on certain common resolutions to bind the Church of England as well as the Dutch communion; but nothing of the kind has ever been thought to exist.[2]

Next, let us consider the position of the Articles, and the attitude of the rival schools towards them. It is perfectly true that High Churchmen rank them far below the Prayer Book in literary and doctrinal value. But they are not alone in such a judgment. It is practically endorsed by every intelligent thinker who examines them dispassionately. But here are a few facts which Mr. Goldwin Smith has omitted, yet which are highly germane to the inquiry. First of all, the Articles are confined to the clergy. No layman, since subscription on matriculation at the Universities was abolished,

[1] Strype, *Annals*, anno 1578.

[2] 'The English that appeared there were no other than four Court divines; their commission and instruction were only from the King .... they had no delegation from the bishops, and by consequence were no representatives of the British Church' (Collier, *Eccl. Hist.*) And Hardwick points out that they had no votes in the Synod at Dort (*Hist. of Articles*, chap. ix.)

has any concern with them. Contrariwise, the Anglican Prayer Book, unlike the Roman Breviary, is as much the book of the laity, in fact as well as in theory, as it is that of the clergy. What is meant for, tendered to, and used by, all must of necessity be of a more binding and representative character than what is addressed to one section only. And further, the Articles have never been propounded by authority in the Church of England in anything like the sense in which the Westminster Confession and the Confession of Augsburg, not to speak of the Creed of Pope Pius IV., are propounded as credenda in other communions. Archbishop Bramhall's statement as regards the nature of the polemical Articles, which has been very widely accepted by other eminent divines, is that they are only 'pious opinions, or inferior truths, which are proposed by the Church of England to all her sons as not to be opposed, not as essentials of faith necessary to be believed by all Christians.'[1] But an examination of the Articles themselves yields some additional particulars which may surprise one who has evidently given them so little attention as Mr. Goldwin Smith. The portion of them which is Protestant in the sense he intends is but a small part of the whole. Taking the celebrated treatise of the Roman Catholic Franciscus a Sancta Clara as a guide to moderate Roman Catholic opinion, we find that he allows Articles I. II. III. IV. V. VII. VIII. X. XVI. XVII. XVIII. XXIII. XXVI. XXVII. XXXIII. XXXVIII. and XXXIX. to be entirely sound and Catholic. He doubts, but is not prepared to condemn, Articles VI., the latter part of IX., the latter part of XXV., and he thinks that Articles XIV. XV. XX. XXI. XXX. XXXV. and XXXVI. merely require the explanation of certain ambiguous clauses to free them from difficulty. The remaining twelve he considers more minutely, minimizing their polemical statements throughout; but it is very remarkable that the one which presents the chief difficulty to his mind is not XXII. XXVIII. XXX. or XXXI. (the specifically anti-Roman ones), but XXXVII., which deals with the authority of the civil magistrates. After all deductions have been made for his object, and for over-subtlety in some of his arguments, it yet remains clear that the Articles are not the body of uncompromising Protestant doctrine which they are popularly held to be. We may make this point a little clearer by indicating some of the things they might be expected to say, yet do not say. They do not

[1] *Schism Guarded*, ii. 476.

assert that the Pope is Antichrist or Rome Babylon. They have no word of condemnation for monastic orders and vows; they do not forbid the use of crucifixes and other images or pictures, nor yet any of the ceremonial adjuncts of Catholic worship. They are entirely silent upon auricular confession. Now here is what Article XXXIII. of the new Reformed Episcopalians has to say on that head:—

'Private confession of sins to a priest, commonly known as auricular confession, has no foundation in the Word of God, and is a human invention. Priestly absolution is a blasphemous usurpation of the sole prerogative of God. None can forgive sins as against God but God alone.'

The contrast is tolerably marked.

The next point of interest in this connexion is that when the Royal Declaration was prefixed to the Articles in 1628 by Charles I. at Laud's suggestion, forbidding the imposition of any meaning on the Articles save their literal and grammatical sense, it was taken by the Puritan school as a heavy and formidable blow, and was the subject of strongly resentful protests from the Calvinistic clergy and from the House of Commons. No objection whatever was made from the other side.[1] And, finally, there never has been any agitation on the part of High Churchmen to abolish or even to revise the Articles (a task which is nevertheless in the future); whereas the Puritan school has never ceased trying to tinker the Prayer Book, has actually done it in Ireland, and has a Liturgical Revision Society, organized to attempt the same process here. That is to say, the High Church school is content to accept the formularies as a whole; the Low Church school desires to be rid of the more important part of them, or at least to metamorphose their doctrinal character.

It is quite true, as we have mentioned above, that the Church of England was gradually transformed into something very like a Calvinist sect under Elizabeth; but Mr. Goldwin Smith has failed to account for a few particulars. First, the attempt made by Whitgift to foist the Lambeth Articles on the Church, which would have formally committed it to Calvinism, broke down. Next, the most repellent doctrines of Calvinism are just as prominent in the teaching of S. Thomas Aquinas as they are in Jonathan Edwardes himself; and if the Jansenists had not been persecuted by the State in France, they would have spread hyper-Augustinianism there quite as widely as it spread in England

[1] Hardwick, *Hist. of Articles*, chap. ix.

under Elizabeth and James I. In fact, predestinarian doctrine is rife even now in the Roman Church, and, provided the special terminology condemned in the cases of Jansen himself, Michael Baius, and Pasquier Quesnel, is avoided, can be taught with perfect impunity. The fact which Mr. Goldwin Smith has obscured by his way of putting things is that the Reformed Church of England neither began nor continued as a Calvinist body. Calvinism was (as we have already said) an episode in its history, as Arianism was in the history of the whole Church fifteen centuries ago, and that is all. The First Prayer Book, that of 1549, was Catholic; the last Prayer Book, that of 1662, was revised under the influence of Catholic-minded Churchmen; and it is playing fast and loose with history to leave the beginning and ending of a long process out of the reckoning, taking account of one of the intermediate steps only.

But there is even more disingenuousness in the argument that the true nature of the High Church movements of Laud and Pusey must be judged by the number of converts they supplied to the Roman Church, as disclosing their true goal. This is much as if we were to judge the goal of an army corps by the stragglers who fall out of line on the march, and not by the movement of the main body. There is, however, a much graver fraud committed on the unsuspecting reader by this way of stating the matter; for it at least implies that no losses to alien societies attended any other movements within the Church. We have not trustworthy statistics of the number of secessions to Rome under Charles I. and the Commonwealth. But there is no reason to believe that they exceeded a dozen or two of clerics, and perhaps a hundred of the laity; for the most part, too, after the overthrow of the Church of England, and in despair of its revival. But the tens of thousands of Presbyterians and Independents who wrought that overthrow were the disciples, or the children of disciples, of the Low Church section amongst the clergy, for hereditary Dissent had scarcely yet come into being. And as to the second period concerned, the fact is that no great reform was ever achieved at so small a cost as that of the Oxford movement. That the Roman Church has made no appreciable impression on the nation at large is fully proved by the marriage returns of the Registrar-General, because the Roman discipline as to marriage is so strict that the statistics of Roman Catholic weddings may be taken as nearly exhaustive. They were 5·09 per cent. of all the marriages solemnized throughout England and Wales in 1853; they were only 4·28

per cent. in 1880; showing that, in despite of births, immigration from Ireland and the Continent, and conversions, Romanism is actually losing ground. It is noticeable, moreover, that in Presbyterian Scotland, although from local causes a less attractive field for immigrants than England, the Roman Catholics are 8·5 of the population, or just double the English ratio. It is also noticeable that Archbishop Boulter of Armagh, who sat from 1724 to 1742, in the heyday of the penal laws, speaks of the large number of converts made in his time by the Roman Church in Ireland; while Bishop Doyle, of Kildare and Leighlin ('J. K. L.'), who died in 1834, mentions that he received a yearly average of two hundred converts from Protestantism.[1] And as regards the stratum of society actually affected by proselytism, a few years ago the *Whitehall Review*, a London weekly paper, published a list of 'Rome's Recruits,' purporting to be the names of all the converts of any sort of social position above the lower middle class from 1833 to 1879. It was intended to make the most of it, and it was very cleverly managed to look as effective as possible. The result was something under two thousand names, of which about 340 were clergymen, scarcely half one year's supply of candidates for Holy Orders, and much less than one per cent. of the whole clerical body during the period covered. But in our article on the 'Church of England in the Eighteenth Century,' already referred to, we showed that the Evangelical clergy, who found thirty-five meeting-houses in Wales in 1736, had raised them to nearly one thousand in 1800; they were fourteen hundred in 1832, and are alleged to be three thousand in 1883. That is to say, the number of entire *congregations* in Wales alone, alienated from the Church by the unfaithfulness of the Evangelical clergy, exceeds by fifty per cent. the total number of identifiable *converts* known to have been made by the Church of Rome during the whole Oxford movement; and yet even those congregations are only the tiniest sample of the actual losses due to the same cause, which may be set down at several millions. And there is, besides, a weighty *per contra*. When the Evangelicals were sending Churchmen into Dissent by hundreds and thousands, they did not draw any outsiders into the Church. It is true that some of their work was useful and permanent; but while it did not a little for personal piety, it certainly fostered the notion that personal piety could be cultivated more successfully in societies free from the formal ordinances of the Church. Contrariwise, since

[1] *Third Letter on the State of Ireland.*

the Catholic Revival has dominated the Church of England, and it has become impossible to contrast that Church unfavourably with Dissent, Nonconformists have flocked in with extraordinary rapidity; nor has there been lacking a smaller, but still quite appreciable, leakage from Romanism. If we say that for every deserter lost to the Church during the Oxford movement fifty recruits have been gained, the number will be far understated, but will suffice to point the contrast.

There is yet another aspect of the debate between the competing schools which requires notice. If there be any one quality on which the Evangelicals plume themselves especially, it is on their peculiar and exclusive love and appreciation of the Bible. One might almost think that it is their private monopoly, and that members of any other school who quote it or appeal to it are guilty of trespass and infringement of trade-mark. But when one comes to examine the lists of books published in England from the rise of the school to the present day, the remarkable fact becomes evident that not only in quality, but in quantity, of solid and useful books bearing on Biblical literature the Evangelicals are the last in the race, Broad and High Churchmen being far in advance of them. There is probably no name amongst them all which stands higher in this category than that of Thomas Scott: and here is the judgment passed on his Commentary by Mr. Spurgeon, who, as the one surviving prop of Calvinism in England, is likely to be a favourable critic of so great a Calvinist light, and indeed complains of Dr. Neale's censures upon him:—

'I know I am talking heresy, but I cannot help saying that for a minister's use Scott is mere milk and water—good and trustworthy, but not solid enough in matter for full-grown men. In the family Scott will hold his place, but in the study you want condensed thought, and that you must look for elsewhere.'[1]

And the same holds true of all other departments of theology. There are not at this moment half a dozen works of any literary value on such topics from the pens of men reared in the Evangelical party within the Church,[2] while there

[1] *Commenting and Commentaries*, p. 12. London, 1876.

[2] The writer of this paper was conversing one day, many years ago, with a bookseller in a large city, who dealt extensively in theological books. The latter happened to say casually, 'You know, sir, I am a Low Churchman.' The reply was, 'Well, Mr. ——, I am not going to talk controversy, but I should like to ask you a question or two, if you do not mind.' 'Not at all, sir.' 'Well, then, you are aware that the dispute between High and Low Church is as to the meaning of certain things laid down in theological books.' 'Yes, sir, that is so.' 'You have a

are many such produced by the smaller and poorer Presbyterian ministry in Scotland, and a tolerable number by the more cultivated among the English Nonconformist teachers. 'These Evangelicals,' says Dr. von Döllinger, 'are wholly destitute of theological culture, and possess and produce only a popular, not a scientific literature. . . . They still exist on the credit of their greater and more active predecessors, and by help of the institutions they founded; but they are not an advancing party, but the reverse.'[1] The High Church theological literature, on the contrary, continues to be what it has been all along, one of the most copious and remarkable literary products of England. It is a literal truth that not one writer of the Puritan school within the Church has survived on his merits. All the great Puritan names, except Ussher, are those of outsiders. Howe, Owen, Lightfoot, Goodwin, may serve as examples; whereas the names of Andrewes, Jeremy Taylor, Hammond, Pearson, Bramhall, Bull, Sanderson, Barrow, Walton, Cosin, and the like, all members of the High Church school, are amongst the most famous worthies of Anglicanism. So it appears that not only is the Church of England most successful when worked on High Church lines, but that the most eminent of her sons have belonged to the same school of opinion: another fact difficult to reconcile with Mr. Goldwin Smith's positions.

Yet again, the policy of the High Church school as a whole, and with the rarest local exceptions, has been in favour of comprehension, of fair and liberal treatment of other sections, as was proved on the largest scale by the extraordinary leniency of the terms offered at the Restoration to the intruded occupants of benefices; whereas the Low Church party has at all times aimed at exclusiveness, and at the extrusion of all who are not in accord with its standards. And it may be partly due to this unlikeness that another broad fact is visible to all who have eyes, namely, the extreme fre-

great many clerical customers of all schools, have you not?' 'Yes, sir, plenty of all kinds.' 'Is there any difference between the quantities of books they buy?' 'Yes, sir; the High Church buy ten for every one the Low Church buy.' 'And is there any difference in the sort of books they buy?' 'Why, yes, sir; the High Church buy good selling books, and the Low Church buy only what we in the trade, begging your pardon, call trash.' 'Is it not, then, just possible, as the dispute is as to books, that the High Church are likely to know more about the rights of the quarrel than the Low?' 'Well, sir, that never struck me before.' Soon after the bookseller left the church he had previously frequented, the most Puritan in the city, and betook himself to the most Ritualistic one.

[1] *Lectures on the Reunion of the Churches*, English translation, p. 172 (London, 1872).

quency of passage from the Evangelical ranks into the High Church ones, and the almost total absence of the converse process; certainly not what is reasonably to be looked for on the hypothesis of the superiority of the Evangelical cause.

We may now address ourselves to Mr. Goldwin Smith's cavil as to the appeal to antiquity. He either does not know, or has chosen to keep back, the fact that this appeal is not a theory which has been invented by the High Church school to serve its own ends, but is the historical, theological, and legal position taken up by the Church of England all through every stage of the Reformation and down to the present day. Not barely one document, but a whole series of them, adopts this as the sole basis of argument against Rome on the one side and Geneva on the other. It will suffice to name in illustration the Preface to the Ordinal, the Act 1 Eliz. cap. i. § 37, Canon XXX. of 1603, and that Canon made in the very Convocation of 1571 that revised and republished the Thirty-nine Articles, which forbids the preaching of any doctrine save that which has been gathered out of the Catholic Fathers and ancient bishops.[1] Nor is there any ambiguity in English ecclesiastical law as to the period covered by the general term 'primitive antiquity,' any more than in common law. Every lawyer knows that in England the legal phrase 'a time whereof the memory of man runneth not to the contrary' is held to carry us back to the time of Richard I.; and so in the ecclesiastical law of England the first five hundred years of Christianity are taken as the range of appeal (1 Edw. VI. c. i. § 7). This principle acts two ways, inclusively and exclusively. It admits, nay, it enjoins, all that was accepted by undivided Christendom down to the pontificate of Symmachus, and thereby covers those tenets of episcopacy, sacerdotalism, and sacramentalism which Mr. Smith derides, even if his sciolist conjecture as to their date be allowed him: for upon his own showing they have three hundred years of prescription to spare. Contrariwise, it excludes all doctrine which can be shown to be of later introduction, and thereby not merely strikes at every distinctively Papal tenet, but equally bars all distinctively Protestant ones. Some of Calvinism may escape, as pleading the precedents of Augustine

[1] Cardinal Newman, in his notes to Mr. William Palmer's *Visit to the Russian Church*, p. 5, points out that this Canon was in force as late as 1663, for Mr. Hope Scott wrote to a friend that he had found the terms of the Canon embodied in the testimonials given by Merton College to a candidate for Orders at that date.

and Prosper, but the Lutheran view of Justification, the Zwinglian theory of the Sacraments, the ordinary Evangelical doctrine of the Atonement, are all unlawful in the Anglican pulpit. It is not permissible only, but compulsory, to test every ambiguous phrase in the formularies by this standard, and to put on each and all of them that interpretation only which is in accord with Catholic antiquity. And therefore the Puritan position within the Church of England is no more than that of tolerated squatters, because any strict and rigid application of this fundamental principle of the English Reformation to their teaching would result in their expulsion. We have no mind to have the process effected, since, to take the lowest motive, and without touching on higher and sounder reasons, that would be to deprive ourselves of our surest recruiting-ground. But such is the constitutional fact: for nothing is historically more easy of demonstration than that the specific tenets known as Protestant are undiscoverable, save in some cases amongst the obscure Gnostic sects, till the later Middle Ages, and were not directly formulated till the sixteenth century.

Finally, we may briefly comment on Mr. Goldwin Smith's curiously infelicitous utterances on the subject of Apostolical Succession and the function of bishops as custodians of the Faith.

Stripped of technicalities, and put into everyday language, all that Apostolical Succession means is that the same rule holds good in the Christian Church as in every well-ordered secular government—namely, that officers cannot appoint themselves, but must derive their commission from the supreme central authority, or from persons empowered thereby. In Great Britain, judges, officers in the army and navy, ministers of public departments of State, and the like, must be named directly by the Crown, justices of the peace by the Lord Chancellor, and so forth. The most admirable legal or military capacity, and the free election of his fellows, would not make a man a lawful general or magistrate with us, apart from higher sanction; and all that is asserted by the tenet of Apostolical Succession is that no man can take upon him any office in the Church who has not been called and set apart thereto[1] by the special class of ecclesiastics who have alone enjoyed that power from the third century downwards beyond all honest question, and in all reasonable probability from Apostolic times, seeing that no research in the

[1] Heb. v. 4; Article XXIII.

Presbyterian interest has hitherto succeeded in showing how and when the innovation, if it were such, arose, or that even one contrary precedent really exists. The only Protestant society in the present day which can fairly claim, on its own principles, to possess a pastorate which is more than a human delegacy is the Irvingite body, because it alleges a special revelation for the purpose. In all other cases popular election, or co-option by ministers who trace back to popular election, is the highest source of the commission.

As to bishops, and their function in safeguarding the Faith, the facts are very unlike Mr. Smith's presentment. No sane person supposes that the rite of consecration makes a bishop infallible, or even a competent theologian. But bishops, so long as they were freely elected, were the chosen representatives and delegates of their dioceses and the custodians of the archives. The meaning, then, of assembling them from all quarters in a council to discuss matters of doctrine, as distinguished from mere disciplinary regulations, was that each might testify whether such or such a tenet had been continuously taught in his diocese as the old doctrine. Concurrent evidence on this head was taken as presumptive proof of Catholic consent, and therefore no bare majority could suffice for such a purpose, virtual unanimity being essential to establish the universality, and therefore the binding character, of any doctrine. Nor was even such a decision final. Acceptance of the decrees by the whole dispersive Church, the ultimate custodian of the Christian Faith, was necessary to entire validation, as is shown by the acceptance as œcumenical of the purely Eastern Synod of Constantinople in 381, and the rejection of the larger and more representative Synod of Ephesus in 449. This principle, moreover, is fatal to the Vatican decrees: for not only were there eighty-eight votes against Papal infallibility, but this minority included the representatives of such great dioceses as Paris, Vienna, Lyons, Munich, Milan, Mainz, Gran, Marseilles, Prague, and every Oriental prelate who ruled over more than a paper see; whereby it was attested that none of these places knew of the dogma as ancient. And the broad fact is that no episcopal Church has ever drifted away from its first standards of doctrine, though in many cases hurtful accretions have been superimposed; whereas a glance at the continent of Europe shows that not one of the great Presbyterian societies, Lutheran, Calvinist, or Zwinglian, has been able to hold firmly to the simplest elements of Christian belief; while even English Nonconformity is honeycombed through and through with

Arianism and kindred forms of rationalistic opinion. Protestantism, which has been aptly defined as 'the Religion of Doubt,' cannot be trusted to guard positive beliefs, and the very existence, not to say the mere welfare, of the Anglican Church depends on the subordination of this factor to the Catholic one, at the same time that the probable destiny of that Church as the appointed intermediary of reconciliation for divided Christendom foretold long ago by De Maistre in his *Considérations sur la France* makes it essential to preserve the Protestant factor, in order not to lose touch of the societies created at and by the Reformation, and all their diverse progeny since.

Art. X.—M. RENAN'S SOUVENIRS.

Souvenirs d'Enfance et de Jeunesse. Par ERNEST RENAN. Fourth Edition. (Paris, 1883.)

As a rule, when a person is an object of very marked interest to himself he ceases to be so to other persons. The mind naturally and instinctively feels disinclined to pay attention to him. The claims which he makes to some degree alarm our suspicions. We are jealous of giving him the hold upon our thoughts which he thinks we ought to give. We resent his intrusion of himself upon our quiet field of studies. If, indeed, a man's autobiography is wrung from him in self-defence, we feel that it is only fair to weigh his *Apologia pro Vita Sua*, and judge between him and his calumniators. Or if he comes before us, though unasked, yet with great diffidence and modesty, or with the masculine absence of sentiment towards himself which characterizes Mr. John Stuart Mill's *Autobiography*, our sympathy is at once attracted. M. Renan's *Souvenirs* do not belong to either of those classes, and yet no one can read them without delight. After all is said and done, we are obliged half unwillingly to confess that M. Renan is an interesting person. He has that curious and naïve delight in himself which can hardly be classed with common vanity and self-conceit. It is a peculiarly French condition of mind. Several of M. Renan's most excellent compatriots of late have shared it with him. M. Gratry had it. Henri Perreyve had it. Such a person stands outside of

himself, and watches his life acted before his eyes. He is the hero of the drama, idealized to his own satisfaction. If here and there, as actor, he fails to play his part to perfection, as spectator he is indulgent and charitable towards himself almost to a fault. He is deeply fascinated with himself. His complacency with the aim of the serio-comedy carries him over the defects in the execution of it; and his admiration for the plot mingles with admiration for the actor. 'Poor fellow!' he seems to say; 'what a difficult and noble part he has to play! and, all things considered, how well he does it! how it grows upon one as one watches!' And then, so charmed as he is with the play, he feels it a positive selfishness to enjoy it all alone. The doors of the play-house are thrown open, and the public are invited to enter. And if any should be so misguided as to criticize a little sharply, the serenity of author, spectator, and hero is not at all disconcerted. He is as much amused at the criticism as at the play, and dismisses the critic with too much good humour even to feel pity for his poor taste.

M. Renan is perfectly conscious that this is the character of his book. He has no intention of merely writing an autobiography, or 'furnishing in advance information for those who will write notices and articles about him.' He feels that 'to imagine that the minute details of one's own life are worth being fixed is to give proof of a very odd vanity.' Such is not at all his purpose. He approves of the title which Goethe adopted for his memoirs—*Dichtung und Wahrheit*—as 'showing thereby that a man cannot write his own life in the same way as he writes another man's. What one says about oneself is always poetry.' In accordance with this idea, although the book is true in a fashion, 'many things have been put in it to raise a smile. Had usage permitted, M. Renan would have had more than once to add in the margin, *cum grano salis*.'[1] We almost wish he had done so, for we feel so much drawn into the train of M. Renan's admirers that we should like sometimes to know what his real opinion is, to get at his real self. That there is a real self somewhere we cannot but believe. Carlyle said of George IV. that, if he had been stripped, there would have been found layer upon layer of waistcoats, but no real man beneath; nothing but waistcoats. If any one were to say of M. Renan that a like process would reveal nothing but

> 'Quips and cranks and wanton wiles,
> Nods and becks and wreathèd smiles,'

[1] *Préface*, pp. iii, iv.

compliments, and epigrams, and pretty phrases, and artistic inconsistencies, and no M. Renan after all, we should be puzzled to refute the stricture, but should refuse to accept it as true.

Our object in this article, however, is not to give M. Renan the amusement (though we would gladly repay him in his own coin) of seeing what we think of his character. Let us take him according to his own description :—

'The point in which above all I remain essentially the pupil of my former masters is my character. When I go through my life again it has been nothing but a practical exhibition of their qualities and their defects. Only these qualities and defects transplanted into the world have brought about the most original incongruities. All's well that ends well; and having found the result of existence on the whole very agreeable, I often amuse myself, like Marcus Aurelius on the banks of the Gran, with reckoning up what I owe to the various influences which have come across my life, and made the web of it. Well, Saint-Sulpice always seems to me the chief factor in it. I speak of it all without hesitation, because my own deserts in the matter are but small. I was well brought up, that is all. My sweetness often springing from indifference at bottom; my indulgence, which, on the contrary, is very sincere, and follows upon my seeing clearly how unjust men are to each other; my conscientious habits, which are to me a pleasure; my indefinite capacity for being bored, perhaps coming from so strong an inoculation of boredom in my youth that I have become rebellious against it for the rest of my life;—all this is explained by the circumstances in which I have lived, and the deep impressions I have received. Since my exit from Saint-Sulpice I have done nothing but deteriorate; and yet, with only the fourth part of the virtues of a Sulpician, I have still been, I believe, far above the average.

'I should be pleased to give a detailed explanation, and to show how the paradoxical attempt to preserve clerical virtues, without the faith which lies at the bottom of them, and in a world which they are not made for, produced, so far as I am concerned, the most diverting incidents. I should like to relate all the adventures which my Sulpician virtues brought me, and the singular tricks they have played me. After sixty years of life in earnest one has the right to smile; and where can a man find a source of laughter more copious, more within reach, more harmless, than in himself? If ever a comic author wished to amuse the public with my absurdities I would only ask one thing at his hands, that he would take me for his partner in the work. I would tell him things twenty times as amusing as any that he might invent' (pp. 345–347).

M. Renan then proceeds to mention the four Sulpician virtues in which he believes himself chiefly to excel. The first and foremost is poverty of spirit, or *désintéressement*. An inward voice has always forbidden his acquiring any landed

property, as contrary to the principle, *Non habemus hic manentem civitatem.* In this respect, however, he does not advise young people to follow his example, but to conform to the fashions of the world. He relates with much pleasantry what befel him one day when M. Michel Lévy entered his lodgings, complimented him on some articles he had written, offered (to his astonishment) to collect them into volumes, and asked whether he would wish any future writings of his to be included in the contract. M. Renan, who had never expected to make anything by writing, considered the offer most generous, and thinking it would be a pity to waste the nice sheet of stamped paper which M. Lévy had brought, suppressed an observation he had thought of making upon the proposal, and signed. He believes that M. Lévy never had reason to regret the bargain, and he is much pleased to have benefited M. Lévy. But he thinks that disinterested workers ought to be considered as minors, and put under the care of a guardian.

The second great virtue of M. Renan is his modesty—more difficult to vindicate, 'because, the moment a man says he is modest, he ceases to be so.' He complains that the public forces him into attempting the proof:—

'It draws the writer into faults, upon which it forthwith comes down severely, like the staid *bourgeoisie* of old which clapped the comedian and at the same time excluded him from the Church. When I am much pleased with myself, I gain the approval of ten persons; when I allow myself to run perilous lengths, where my literary conscience hesitates and where my hand trembles, thousands tell me to go on.'

The proof of his modesty lies in the fact that his success might have been greater had he chosen:—

'If I had chosen to make a *crescendo* of anti-clericalism after the *Vie de Jésus*, what popularity I might have attained! . . . I spent a year in watering down the style of the *Vie de Jésus*, thinking that such a subject could only be treated in the soberest and simplest manner.'

M. Renan's third virtue is politeness, on which subject he has a charming fecundity of happy sayings; and his fourth virtue consists of general self-discipline:—

'Conscientious as I am, I wished to stand right with myself, and continued to live in Paris as I had done in the seminary. Later on, I quite saw the vanity of this virtue as of all others; I recognized, in particular, that nature does not at all care about a man's being chaste. Still, for convenience, I persisted all the same in the life that I had chosen, and adopted the morals of a Protestant minister. A man ought never to allow himself to be daring in two directions at once.

A freethinker should be strict in morals. I know several Protestant ministers, very broad in their views, who cover everything by their blameless white ties.'

How much of all this is serious, and how much is fun? How much of it is what M. Renan calls 'un mensonge joyeux, de pure eutrapélie?' How far does the author intend us to identify him with the character he depicts and so well sustains? The question is one of interest, because upon the answer to it depends in some measure the weight which should be attached to M. Renan's earlier writings. It concerns nobody to judge M. Renan himself, or to estimate his character for the mere purpose of praising or blaming him; but every one is concerned with the questions raised in his *Vie de Jésus* and the subsequent volumes. And if the light, careless, Hellenic good humour—the *ironie gaie*—the strange and captivating mixture of optimism and cynicism which this new volume shows, is really the character of the writer, then, though he must be the most charming of holiday companions, we should feel that it was not worth while seriously to examine the truth of his statements or the correctness of his conclusions, but we should only feel inwardly pained that he had chosen subjects of so grave and sacred a nature for the display of his 'mensonges de pure eutrapélie.' Examples of this 'pure eutrapélie,' applied to the life of Christ may be found in plenty in this volume. It is the very soul of the imaginative *Prière sur l'Acropole*, where the hero of the book is made to address Athene in the following terms:—

'Des prêtres d'un culte étranger . . . m'apprirent les longues histoires de Cronos, qui a créé le monde, et de son fils, qui a, dit-on, accompli un voyage sur la terre . . . J'ai écrit, selon quelques-unes des règles que tu aimes, ô Théonoé, la vie du jeune dieu que je servis dans mon enfance; ils me traitent comme un Evhémère; ils m'écrivent pour me demander quel but je me suis proposé. Et pourquoi écrit-on la vie des dieux, ô ciel! si ce n'est pour faire aimer le divin qui fut en eux, et pour montrer que ce divin vit encore et vivra éternellement au cœur de l'humanité? . . . Sagesse, toi que Zeus enfanta, toi qui habites dans ton père, entièrement unie à son essence, . . . tard je t'ai connue, beauté parfaite' (pp. 64, 66, 67, 70).

It is another sample of the same spirit when M. Renan says of himself, 'J'ai pu, seul en mon siècle, comprendre Jésus et François d'Assise,' instancing, to prove his understanding of our Lord, his 'extreme indulgence for weaknesses of which his own conscience does not condemn him:'—

'Je ne peux m'ôter,' he continues, 'de l'idée que c'est peut-être après tout le libertin qui a raison et qui pratique la vraie philosophie

de la vie. De là quelques surprises, quelques admirations exagérées. Sainte-Beuve, Théophile Gautier me plurent un peu trop. Leur affectation d'immoralité m'empêcha de voir le décousu de leur philosophie. La peur de sembler un pharisien, l'idée, tout évangélique du reste, que l'immaculé a le droit d'être indulgent, la crainte de tromper si, par hasard, tout ce que disent les professeurs de philosophie n'était pas vrai, ont donné à ma morale un air chancelant. En réalité, c'est qu'elle est à toute épreuve. Ces petites libertés sont la revanche que je prends de ma fidélité a observer la règle commune. De même, en politique, je tiens des propos réactionnaires pour n'avoir pas l'air d'un sectaire libéral. Je ne veux pas qu'on me croie plus dupe que je ne le suis en réalité ; j'aurais horreur de bénéficier de mes opinions ; je redoute surtout de me faire à moi-même l'effet d'un placeur de faux billets de banque. Jésus, sur ce point, a été mon maître plus qu'on ne pense, Jésus, qui aime à provoquer, à narguer l'hypocrisie, et qui, par la parabole de l'enfant prodigue, a posé la morale sur sa vraie base, la bonté du cœur, en ayant l'air d'en renverser les fondements' (p. 149–151).

M. Renan is fond of saying that he is incapable of hurting anybody, and we are willing to believe that this is true. But a little thought would have shown him that what he has written pains deeply every Christian reader, and that there was no call to write it. Christians can bear a grave and responsible investigation, even if it leads a man to deny their most cherished convictions; but they cannot, without indignation, see the life of their Lord and Saviour made subservient to the purposes of a flippant spirit of *eutrapélie*.

If, however, we could get rid of the passages that affront and shock a Christian by their levity, there is abundant matter in this volume to interest and charm us. Nothing could be more delightful than the views of old-fashioned life in Brittany, with its grave and fatherly priests, its poor and dignified squires like the 'broyeur de lin,' its breezy, haunted moorlands, its granite cathedrals sleeping in their sombre towns, its cultus of strange half-savage Celtic saints. As we read we cannot but be struck with the contrast and the likeness between M. Renan's country and the kindred shores of Cornwall opposite. The names of the places are the same. The same saints have left their traces in both. There is the same eager, emotional thirst for religion. The hills and dales in both are sprinkled thick with chapels. M. Renan says it was but an accident which prevented the French Bretons from becoming Protestants. It was only by a kind of accident that the Cornish, who fought for the Latin Mass and then for the Stuarts and the Prayer-Book, became the Protestant people they are now. There would have been nothing strange

if the Breton chapels had been Methodist meeting-houses, and the Cornish ones centres of superstitious saint-worship. M. Renan himself though we confess ourselves unable to find on the map of Cornwall the place which he says bears Saint Renan's name has some elements of the Cornish character.

His father and grandfather were Breton sailors. His mother was of a Gascon family, and from her it was, he tells us, that he derived his inexhaustible gaiety of heart. When he was first born it was not thought he would live, but an old witch named Gwic had an infallible mode of discovering the truth. She took one of his little shirts, went with it one morning to a sacred pool and threw it in. She came back with a face of triumph, crying 'He'll live, he'll live!' The wind had caught the arms of the garment and blown it along the surface. His father's life as a child had been saved in sickness by a curious expedient. He was carried to the chapel of the saint whose business it was to cure such cases, accompanied by a blacksmith with forge, nails, and pincers, who lighted his furnace, heated his iron, and holding it up within a foot of the saint's face, said, 'If you do not take the fever out of that child I'll shoe you like a horse!' The saint instantly obeyed. M. Renan's native place was the village of Tregnier, on the north coast of Brittany, until the Revolution a bishop's see, 'crushed by its cathedral.' It was that cathedral, he thinks, 'a mad attempt to realize in granite an impossible ideal,' which set him wrong at starting. The anti-normal paradox made him chimerical, a belated disciple of the old Celtic saints, incapable of any practical work.

M. Renan was early left fatherless, with his mother, one brother, and one sister. His physical weakness and incapacity for games made him shrink from the companionship of boys of his own age, who had a contempt for him, and called him 'Mademoiselle.' He accordingly took refuge with the girls, among whom he was a great favourite. One of the prettiest and most touching parts of the book is that in which he tells the story of 'little Naomi,' an early flame of his, although, as he frankly confesses us, his usual habit of seeing two sides to a question did not leave 'little Naomi' without a rival. 'Je laissai ainsi bifurquer mon premier amour, comme plus tard je laissai bifurquer ma politique, de la façon la plus maladroite.' Until the age of fifteen M. Renan was a pupil in the cathedral school at Tregnier. He had never entertained a thought of being anything else but a priest. His education was conducted by the worthy clergy of the place, for whom he had,

and still has, the utmost veneration. No education could have been less literary:—

'We made many Latin verses; but that there had been such a thing as any French poetry since the younger Racine's poem on *Religion* was admitted by no one. The name of Lamartine was only pronounced with a sneer, the existence of Victor Hugo was unknown. The study of history and natural science was equally in abeyance. To make up for this, they made us push on pretty far with mathematical studies. I worked at them with passionate ardour; those abstract combinations made me dream day and night.'

M. Renan gives a delightful account of the moral discipline he was under:—

'Moral discipline was the point on which the good priests insisted most, and their own irreproachable conduct gave them the right to do so. Their sermons on the subject had a profound effect upon me, sufficient to preserve me chaste all through my youth. These discourses had a solemnity in them which overpowered me. The character of them is so deeply engraven upon my brain that I cannot recall them without a kind of terror. Sometimes it was the example of Jonathan about to die for having eaten a little honey: *Gustans gustavi paululum mellis, et ecce morior.* That gave me endless reflections. What was the little honey which brings death? The preacher took care not to say, and accentuated the point by the mysterious words *Tetigisse periisse*, said in a deep and tearful tone. Sometimes the text was the passage of Jeremiah: *Mors ascendit per fenestras*, which perplexed me far more still. The death which climbs up through the windows, the butterfly wings which are tarnished the moment you touch them—what could they mean? While speaking thus the preacher stood with updrawn brows, his eyes fixed on the sky. . . . To get rid of these insoluble puzzles I plunged passionately into my studies, and thought no more about them' (pp. 12–14).

With this may be compared the later passage:—

'The fact is that what people say about the morals of the clergy is, so far as my experience goes, entirely unfounded. I spent thirteen years of my life in the hands of the priests, and never saw the shadow of a scandal. I have never known a priest who was not a good man. Confession may, in some countries, be attended by things which ought not to be. I never saw a trace of it in my church youth. The old book which I used in self-examination was innocence itself. Only one sin excited my curiosity and apprehension. I was afraid of having committed it without knowing. One day I grasped my courage with both hands and showed my confessor the sentence which troubled me. It was this: "Practising simony in conferring of benefices." I asked my confessor what it meant, and whether perhaps I had been guilty of the sin. The worthy man reassured me, and told me that such an act was quite out of my reach' (p. 139).

M. Renan sketches what his career would have been had he continued, as there was every reason to suppose he would, in the seminary of Tréguier :—

'Everything marked me out for a modest ecclesiastical career in Brittany. I should have made a very good priest, indulgent, fatherly, charitable, without a stain on my character. . . . My career would have been as follows : at twenty-two years old a master in the school at Tréguier ; towards fifty a canon, perhaps archdeacon, at Saint-Brieuc, a very conscientious man, much looked up to, a good, safe director. Espousing the new dogmas without much enthusiasm, I should have had boldness to go so far as to say, like many good Churchmen, after the Vatican Council, *Posui custodiam ori meo.* My antipathy towards the Jesuits would have found its expression in never speaking of them ; a moderate Gallicanism at bottom would have been cloaked under the guise of a profound knowledge of canon law' (p. 158).

The course of M. Renan's life was changed by an accident. In his most graphic manner he tells the well-known story of the way in which young M. Dupanloup, the future Bishop, then chiefly known for his powers as a catechist, suddenly sprang into celebrity by the skill and tact with which he reconciled to the Church the dying Talleyrand. Archbishop de Quélen was delighted at the success of his agent. That aristocratic prelate, who 'loved piety,' says M. Renan, 'but a piety of the world, in good taste, without the barbarities of scholasticism or the jargon of the mystic, a piety which put the finish to an ideal of good society,' conceived the brilliant thought of putting M. Dupanloup at the head of Saint-Nicolas de Chardonnet, the junior seminary of the diocese of Paris. Up to that time Saint-Nicolas had been conducted upon the narrowest of clerical principles, and very insufficient even for its limited purpose of supplying the diocese of Paris. The new Superior resolved upon a complete revolution. A brilliant educationist, he felt that the best training for boys who were destined for the priesthood, especially in Paris, was to mix with boys of the upper classes destined for high positions in lay life, and to pass through the same curriculum. No science was taught, and no theology. M. Dupanloup was as ignorant of the one as of the other. The foundation was to be laid in Christian piety and classical literature. 'M. Dupanloup's absolute faith in classical studies showed itself in this. Those studies, to him, formed part of religion. Virgil seemed to him to form part of the intellectual culture of a priest at least as much as the Bible.' The scheme succeeded brilliantly. In order to recruit the sacer-

dotal element in the school, M. Dupanloup employed agents in all parts of France, especially in the West, and in his native Savoy, whose duty it was to find out promising boys and bring them to Paris. In the summer of 1836, young Ernest Renan had just carried off all the prizes of his form at the seminary of Tréguier. The list fell into the hands of one of M. Dupanloup's recruiting sergeants :—

'In an instant my fate was decided. "Make him come," said the impetuous Superior. I was fifteen years and a half old. We had not time to think. I was on my holidays at a friend's house, in a village near Tréguier. In the afternoon of September 4 a messenger came to fetch me. I remember that walk home as if it were yesterday. It was a three-mile walk across country. The holy sound of the evening Angelus, answering from parish to parish, poured into the air a kind of calm sweet melancholy, emblematic of the life which I was leaving for ever. The next day I started for Paris. On the 7th I saw things as new to me as if I had been flung with a jerk into France from Tahiti or Timbuctoo' (p. 171).

English Churchmen feel often tempted to covet the unity which they are incessantly told is the distinguishing mark of the whole Papal Communion. It is constantly impressed upon us that no one would ever observe any disagreement, either in teaching, or in the externals of religion, between one part of that Communion and another. We have still, it is true, much to learn from them in that respect. But it is impossible to read a book like M. Renan's without perceiving how similar the state of affairs within the bosom of the French Church is to that within our own. Faction does not run to such violent lengths, but men there take very divergent views of truth and life, just as they do with us. No system can pare men down into being just alike. This comes out quite incidentally in the *Souvenirs*, and it is no part of the author's design to prove it; the evidence therefore is all the more striking. The old 'High and Dry' Gallicans with their dislike of new-fangled methods; the new Liberal-Ultramontane school, insisting upon nothing hard and fast, so long as they can bring men into communion with the Roman see, desirous only of popularizing everything; the ardently ascetic and evangelistic type, despising learning, dogma, politics, everything, in comparison of work for souls; the broad, educational, literary turn of mind, which aims mainly at leavening society through the medium of culture;—all these stand out vividly in M. Renan's pages, and it would not be hard to draw comparisons between them and various tendencies among ourselves. Even on the teaching staff of the seminary

of Saint-Sulpice were to be found clergymen who had but little sympathy for each others' views. Though Saint-Nicolas de Chardonnet was the recognized preparatory school for Saint-Sulpice, the contrast of thought between the two places was so marked that the tutors at Saint-Sulpice never would mention the name of M. Dupanloup. And no shock that an English boy could receive in exchanging an Evangelical home for Oxford ritualism or the ministrations of Mr. Haweis or the late Dean of Westminster would be more violent than M. Renan received in exchanging Tréguier for Saint-Nicolas.

The crisis was tremendous. His going to Paris was, he says, the passing from one religion to another. There was no resemblance between the Christianity of Brittany and that of Paris:—

'My old priests, in their heavy Roman cloaks, seemed to me like wizards, having the words of eternal life; now, what I was shown was a religion of indienne and calico, a piety all scented and beribboned, a devotion of little candles and little flower-pots, a theology of the young-lady type, without solidity, of an indefinable style, composite, like the polychrome frontispiece of a book of Hours from Lebel's.'

M. Dupanloup, in his imperious manner of acting, like the general of an army, had hardly calculated all the consequences, or thought how many killed and wounded there would be among his young recruits. Ernest Renan was seized with a violent attack of home-sickness, of which he was nearly dying. Some of his fellow-pupils actually died of it. A passionate letter of longing for his mother was shown to M. Dupanloup, and woke in him (the most dutiful of sons) a special feeling for the poor Breton boy. That evening he was reading out the week's marks. Renan had not done well in his composition. 'Ah!' said the Superior, 'if the subject had been that of a letter which I read this morning, Ernest Renan would have been first.'

The impression of Dupanloup which the *Souvenirs* gives us is not altogether a satisfying one. There is dash, fire, genius, sense of power, commanding will, the greatness which takes in details as well as broad effects, perfection of manners, desire to be of service to all: but we lack repose and depth, and insight into intellectual and spiritual needs. We can sympathize with the writer, when, in his retrospect, he prefers the modest solidity of Saint-Sulpice to the diffusive humanism which reigned at Saint-Nicolas. But M. Dupanloup was the man to awaken and inspire boys. It was no wonder that they worshipped him. He was like a god to

his pupils. Every evening, instead of the half-hour's reading from some devotional book which used to be the rule of the seminary, M. Dupanloup gave the boys a discourse of his own. The two hundred young faces, in the ground-floor lecture-room, were always motionless and rapt with attention and reverence. But the effect was not always lasting. Among the future bishops and archbishops on those close-packed benches were some who could not bear so great a strain. One, who was thought by the Sulpicians an instance of indefectible predestination, became a wild revolutionary in America. Another was Verger, who stabbed Archbishop Sibour. 'The education had its dangers; it was over-heating, over-exciting, and might easily bring on madness.'

For three years M. Renan continued in this atmosphere, so unlike what his childhood had been used to. Though Saint-Nicolas was supposed to be a quiet haven, secluded from the noise of the external world, it was, in fact, the most brilliant and worldly of establishments. It was an epitome of Paris, though happily of Paris minus its moral corruption. The revolutionary forces, the literary and intellectual antagonisms, the historical scepticism, which were at work in Paris, made their way into the seminary like a flood. Victor Hugo, Lamartine, and Michelet were the perpetual topic of discussion among the boys. For nearly a year the fertile rhetoric of the Superior exercised itself, night after night, at the *lecture spirituelle*, upon hardly anything else but the new romantic school. The Breton boy was completely transformed under the powerful alchemy. His mind became open and alert:—

'There was no doubt something deficient in this education, and supposing I had never had anything besides, there would always have been a gap in my mind. There was a lack of positive science; there was no thought of a critical search of truth. The superficial humanism put my reasoning powers into a three-years' slumber, at the same time that it destroyed the first simplicity of my faith. My Christianity underwent great losses, although there was as yet nothing in my mind that could be called doubt. Each year, when the holidays came, I went back to Brittany, where, in spite of more than one mental difficulty, I became again just the same self as my first masters had made me' (p. 196).

From Saint-Nicolas de Chardonnet, M. Renan passed into the senior seminary of Saint-Sulpice, at least into that dependency of Saint-Sulpice situated in the suburb of Issy, where the two years' course of philosophy was given, preparatory to the more directly theological teaching of the

mother house. The history of the foundation of Saint-Sulpice by Jean Jacques Olier is probably well known to most readers of this Review from Mrs. Lear's work on the *Revival of Priestly Life in France in the XVIIth Century*; but there is a freshness and a nicety of discrimination in M. Renan's account which makes it well worth reading. A foreigner, and one brought up in an *alter orbis* of ecclesiastical ideas, could not be expected to catch, as Mr. Renan has done, the characteristic ideas of the institution as compared with other institutions within the same communion. The great novelty of Saint-Sulpice as first founded was that it was bound up with parochial work. It was not a close seminary, containing within its own bosom all the teaching that it needed. For all theological instruction the young seminarists were sent out to the Sorbonne. Thus the teaching received was of a broad and national type. The seminary was only like a kind of hostel, to which the students returned for conference, devotion, private tuition. Such a state of things passed away, however, at the time of the fatal Concordat which sealed the bondage of the French Church; and when M. Renan went to Saint-Sulpice all the lectures were given at home, though the traces of the old system were to be seen in the fact that there were no 'professeurs;' all the members of the congregation were called 'directeurs.'

Issy and Saint-Sulpice alike were places where an entirely different spirit reigned from that which Ernest Renan had for three years been imbibing. He found himself once more among divines of the old school, whose oracle was Bossuet, strongly Gallican, mystically inclined, some of them almost half Jansenist. Self-suppression was the great aim of the school; and anything like brilliancy was looked upon with aversion and suspicion. Men who might have aspired to a far different ideal chose mediocrity for its own sake. 'Death wedded to emptiness,' said Michelet, on hearing of an alliance of the Jesuits with the Sulpicians. The flashy Neo-Catholicism of Lacordaire and Montalembert was abhorrent to them. It was their desire to play no tricks, but to be absolutely and rigidly honest in their conservative dogmatism:—

'At Saint-Sulpice no extenuation of Scriptural dogmas was allowed. The Fathers, the Councils, and the Doctors, were seen to be the fountain heads of Christianity. They did not there prove the Divinity of Jesus Christ by Mahomet or by the battle of Marengo. Those theological feats (*pantalonnades*), which people were induced to clap at Notre Dame by force of earnestness and eloquence, had no success among such serious Christians. They did not think that

dogma needed to be watered down, tricked up, bedizened after the manner of young France. They showed a want of the critical faculty in imagining that the Catholicism of the divines was the very religion of Jesus and the Apostles; but they did not invent for men of the world a Christianity revised and adapted to their notions. For this reason the serious study—shall I say the reform?—of Christianity is more likely to issue from Saint-Sulpice than from quarters like M. Lacordaire or M. Gratry—*à fortiori* M. Dupanloup—where everything is softened down, given a twist, emasculated; where a Christianity is presented, which is not the result of the Council of Trent or of the Council of the Vatican, but a Christianity which is, so to speak, *boned*, without edges, deprived of all that is its essence. Conversions produced by that kind of preaching are good neither for religion nor for the human mind. Woe to him who is vague! better the man who is wrong!' (p. 216).

The most perfect liberty was allowed to the students of Issy. Those who wished to work could work with great advantages; those who did not were not forced; and not a few availed themselves of the freedom. There were scarcely any examinations and no competition. The head of the house was a gentleman of the most polite manners, simple piety, and great erudition, named Gosselin, of whom M. Renan relates the following amusing story. When he was a little boy every one was obliged for safety's sake to address his neighbour as 'citizen.' On one of the first days that Mass was allowed to be celebrated after the Revolution his mother took him to church. They found themselves almost alone with the priest. 'Go,' said Madame Gosselin, 'and offer to serve the gentleman at his Mass.' The boy went up to him, and blushing, lisped, 'Citizen, may I serve you?' 'Sh!' said the mother, 'you should never say "citizen" to a priest.' The other two *directeurs* with whom M. Renan had most to do were M. Gottofrey, the lecturer in philosophy, and M. Pinault, the lecturer in mathematics and physics. The latter, ugly, dirty, mystical, and original, had a little clique of partizans of his own in opposition to good M. Gosselin, under whose direction M. Renan was. The quiet studiousness of the young Breton was not at all that his burning zeal approved. When M. Renan would stroll out into the lovely park with which Margaret de Valois had adorned her villa, little thinking that it would be turned into a seminary, and sat down, wrapped round with a rug, to read Clarke *On the Being of God*, M. Pinault would come near and 'chaff' him with the kind of chaff which was characteristic of him. 'Oh, the dear little treasure! *Mon Dieu*, how nicely packed up! Oh, don't disturb him! He'll always be like that. He'll read, read without stopping; when

poor souls need and call for him he'll still read. Well furred and wrapped up, he'll say to those who come to fetch him, "Oh, leave me alone, leave me alone!"' Then, seeing that the arrow had struck, he wrung his hand and said, with a half-repressed sneer, 'He'll make another little Gosselin.' Another of the lecturers, M. Manier, taught M. Renan to calm himself by reading the Scotch school of philosophy, especially Thomas Reid. 'The Scotch school,' he said, fortifying the young fellow against the alarming assaults of M. Pinault, 'restores serenity, and leads on to Christianity.'

For a long time the good Presbyterian Reid became M. Renan's ideal—at once a philosopher and a minister of the Gospel. He dreamed of living the life of a hardworking clergyman, set free from the ordinary duties to devote himself to research. Little by little he began to see the unsatisfactoriness of that dry, dogmatic, scholastic philosophy which the text-book in use contained, where every objection to each thesis was forcibly stated and feebly demolished. He uses almost the very words which are used of the intellectual development of the greatest of English theologians: 'Before this . . . Mr. Bull had spent his time entirely in reading little systems of divinity, and had arrived at so great a perfection in that method of study . . . that he was master of all those objections and solutions which so frequently occur in those writings. But his judgment being now come to a greater ripeness, he grew more and more out of conceit with that sort of divinity.'[1] Alas for Mr. Renan, however, he had not the same free and noble Catholic literature to turn to which helped Bishop Bull at that juncture. He began to disrelish theology altogether. Metaphysics forfeited his confidence. The mathematical turn of his mind sought for a positive and inductive basis of thought. Without quite knowing what it came to, or seeing any contradiction between it and Christianity, he came to hold that there was no such thing as a special creation, but that an 'eternal *fieri*, a ceaseless metamorphosis,' was the law of the world. Yet his Christian faith was not in reality much impaired. Had he been left to Messrs. Gosselin, Pinault, and Manier, his mind might have gone on at ease without ever recognizing its anomalous position. But M. Gottofrey's keen insight and ardour, worthy of a fanatic, would not let him be:—

'M. Gottofrey very seldom spoke to me, but he watched me narrowly and with very great curiosity. My Latin arguments, de-

[1] Nelson's *Life of Bull*, ch. v.

livered in a firm, emphatic tone, astonished and disquieted him. Sometimes I was only too right; sometimes I let it be seen where I thought the reasons alleged as valid were feeble. One day when my objections had been pushed with vigour, and the feebleness of the replies raised some smiles in the gathering, he stopped the discussion. In the evening he took me apart. He talked to me eloquently on the unchristianness of trusting to the reason, of the injury which rationalism does to faith. He became singularly animated, and reproached me with my taste for study. What was the good of research? Everything that was essential had been already found out. It was not science that saved souls. Working himself up little by little, at last he cried with passionate accents, "You are not a Christian!"'

The effect of the words was to strike the young man's heart with fright such as he had never felt before. He half entertained the thought of leaving the seminary at once, but his other teachers reassured him for the time. Afterwards he learned to regret that he did not follow the course suggested by M. Gottofrey's lightning flash. He thinks that he would have given himself up to science, and feels sure that in that case he would have forestalled several of the discoveries of Darwin, of which he had even then an inkling. History is an unsatisfactory branch of study, the results of which are conjectural, and constantly superseded. The age which we are approaching is one in which mankind will care but little to know about its past. But, as a matter of fact, M. Renan did not leave the seminary. His time at Issy was up, and he passed on to Saint-Sulpice itself, where the critical study of Hebrew and Scripture compelled him to believe that the Christian faith was untenable.

He was comfortable enough at Saint-Sulpice, although it was not in all respects what he was prepared for. Old M. Garnier, the General of the congregation, was a plain, learned old man, without any affectation of superior spirituality such as had been in vogue at Issy, whose manner of dealing with Scripture was much that of the older German Protestant scholars, such as Rosenmüller and Hug. An instance of the way in which he accepted and dealt with Old Testament difficulties was the case of Sarah's adventures in Egypt. Sarah, at the date when Pharaoh conceived that passion for her which reduced Abraham to such shifts, must, according to the text, have been about seventy years of age. M. Garnier used to remark that, after all, such cases had been known elsewhere, and that 'Mademoiselle de Lenclos' had been the cause of duels between rival lovers at the age of threescore years and ten. As the old man was too feeble to lecture himself, his lectures

were read for him by M. Carbon, a pattern of kindness and goodness, who was virtually director of the house. M. Le Hir, his favourite pupil, a Breton, and, according to M. Renan's estimate, the most remarkable clergyman that France has produced in modern times, was Hebrew lecturer, and joined with the faith of an Ultramontane the clear perception of every difficulty which rationalism could suggest, and of all the greatness of every difficulty.

M. Renan at once attached himself with ardour to M. Le Hir, and learned from him Hebrew, Syriac, and Arabic in a very short space of time. He was simultaneously allowed the privilege of attending a course delivered at the Collège de France (where he himself was afterwards to become Hebrew professor) by M. Quatremère. This gentleman's mode of dealing with miracles did not satisfy M. Renan. Minimizing the miraculous element in the case of occurrences like that of Ajalon, he allowed the principle to the full in the New Testament, a mode of treatment which M. Renan stigmatizes as 'semi-rationalism' and 'superficial eclecticism.' But though dissatisfied with the general stability of Christian dogmas from a philosophical point of view, it was not from reasons of abstract thought that M. Renan's faith fell. Before he had been long at Saint-Sulpice an assistant lecturer in Oriental studies was required, and the directors offered the post to their gentle pupil. The necessity of systematizing his thoughts so as to impart them to his fellow-students led him to the full examination of the questions concerned. It became necessary to learn German. He became enamoured of the German spirit. He felt that it was like entering a temple to be introduced to minds which united such a lofty religion with so critical a mind. Sometimes he longed to have been a Protestant, that he might be able to combine philosophy and Christianity; then, again, he reflected that Catholicism is the only self-consistent form of Christianity. Christianity and the Bible must fall altogether, if at all. A single fault in the Bible, a single legendary story, and the book is no longer Divine and inspired. If the latter half of Isaiah is not Isaiah's, if Daniel belongs to the era of the Maccabees, if the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is untenable, if the Book of Judith is an historic impossibility, the whole Bible is human. To admit one such proposition is to cease (in France) to be a Catholic. The artifices by which Neo-Catholicism seeks to impose upon laymen are, to M. Renan's mind, thoroughly dishonest. The rigid orthodoxy of Saint-Sulpice is the only honest Catholicism. And M. Renan

found, as he went on, that such a Catholicism was not compatible with true criticism of the Bible.

The letters written by M. Renan at the time, both to his confessor and to a friend in the seminary of Saint-Brieuc, show how keen the struggle was, and how much it cost him to abandon what hitherto had been his life. Even now, many friends were endeavouring to persuade him to regard his doubts as so many 'temptations,' and to stifle and forget them. Some wished him to proceed at once to the orders of a subdeacon. His good sense rightly shrank with horror from the proposal. After spending a sad vacation with his mother in Brittany, where she guessed all, although she could not enter into it, he returned to Saint-Sulpice only to take his leave, and to wear his student's cassock for the last time. M. Dupanloup generously offered him whatever money he might need for a new start, and found him a temporary place in the Collège Stanislas, of which M. Gratry was then principal. He saw, however, that their intention was to make him begin again at the beginning, whereas he felt it his duty to go straight on. Accordingly he left M. Gratry, and took secular work in connexion with the Lycée Henri IV.

At this point we part company with M. Renan, only assuring him, if this article should ever chance to come under his notice, that we have the deepest sympathy with the struggle through which, at that sad period of his life, he had to pass. We may avow that we are of that number (of whom he now speaks with some amusement) who, in studying what he tells us of his life, feel that the main reasons which drove him out of the Church were in themselves insufficient. We have no wish to reduce Catholicism to 'that insipid compromise, all very well for the laity, which has in our days produced so many absurdities.' Neither have we, on the other hand, any wish to accuse the good Sulpicians for their want of breadth and elasticity. They acted with perfect honesty. According to the instructions given them they could do no otherwise. But M. Renan is mistaken when he says that the Catholicism which they presented to him was 'the Catholicism of the Bible.' The Catholicism of the Bible teaches men first and foremost to seek truth—all truth—fearlessly. It teaches that everyone who is of the truth is a subject of Christ. It teaches that if any class of men are doomed to damnation, it is not the men who have arrived at wrong conclusions, but the men who received not the love of the truth. If any definition or form of opinion which has been esteemed Catholic turns out upon deeper investigation to be inconsistent with

facts, then the Catholicism of the Bible would teach that the definition, useful enough it may be in its own time, needs recasting. Not that Catholicism retreats, and abandons one position after another as untenable, and draws back upon some few truths deemed to be essential while others are non-essential; on the contrary, at each fresh discovery Catholicism advances; the abandonment of untenable positions (such as that the sun goes round the earth) is but the negative way of stating that Catholicism has gained a truth. And if ever the time should come—it is not come yet—when it is proved that the book of Daniel was written under Antiochus Epiphanes, or that the Second Epistle of S. Peter is the work of an author of the second century, the Catholicism of the Bible will welcome the demonstration, and will, under the guidance of the Spirit of Truth, adjust the relation in which those books stand to the Church. To those who have grasped the central historical truth of the Incarnation, it is no shock to find that an inspired writer ascribes to Jeremiah words that are found in Zechariah; it only modifies and enriches his conception of the nature and mode of inspiration. Such details might conceivably be adduced by the hundred, and he would only find his grasp of Christ strengthened. Strict and free criticism of the records is his own heritage, and he learns with ever-deepening significance to use the words (true, even if they do not represent the original), 'Thy word is tried to the uttermost: and Thy servant loveth it.'

The readers of this Review will not be hard upon M. Renan for not having seen through the specious fallacy which says: 'If the Church avows that Daniel is apocryphal, she avows that she has been mistaken; and if she has been mistaken in that point, she may be mistaken in another; she is no longer divinely inspired.' They will not be hard upon him for not seeing the shallowness of 'the inexorable phrase of M. Littré, "After all the researches that have been made never has a miracle been wrought in circumstances where it could be observed and tested."' They will fully believe that at the time when M. Renan left Saint-Sulpice he was deeply in earnest, and did his best to see what was to be said for Christian faith. They will have nothing but sorrowing respect for the line which he then took. But they cannot but fear that there is truth in M. Renan's good-natured confession, that since he left Saint-Sulpice he has done nothing but deteriorate. It is not that they grudge him the buoyant spirits which make him so fascinating a writer. They do not want to see him gloomy. They hardly even claim—much as

they would wish it—that in this life he should gravely go into the whole question afresh. But they cannot think that at the time he left Saint-Sulpice he would have turned the whole affair into jest, or written such passages as this:—

'La formule exacte de l'engagement que [les premiers degrés de la cléricature] impliquent est contenue dans les paroles du psaume qu'on prononce : *Dominus pars hæreditatis meæ et calicis mei. Tu es qui restitues hæreditatem meam mihi.* Eh bien, la main sur la conscience, cet engagement-là, je n'y ai jamais manqué. . . . Une idée élevée m'a toujours soutenu dans la direction de ma vie : si bien même, que l'héritage que Dieu devrait me rendre, d'après notre arrangement réciproque, ma foi ! je l'en tiens quitte. Mon lot a été bon, et je peux ajouter en continuant le psaume : *Portio cecidit mihi in præclaris ; etenim hæreditas mea præclara est mihi'* (p. 305).

Nor would he at that time have written the *mensonge d'eutrapélie* with which the narrative concludes, and in which the pathetic weariness is clearly seen through the inimitable ironical mirth, and wakens in us a tender pity rather than any other feeling:—

'Je renie les blasphèmes que les défaillances de la dernière heure pourraient me faire prononcer contre l'Éternel. L'existence qui m'a été donnée sans que je l'eusse demandée a été pour moi un bienfait. Si elle m'était offerte, je l'accepterais de nouveau avec reconnaissance. Le siècle où j'ai vécu n'aura probablement pas été le plus grand, mais il sera tenu sans doute pour le plus amusant des siècles. A moins que mes dernières années ne me réservent des peines bien cruelles, je n'aurai, en disant adieu à la vie, qu'à remercier la cause de tout bien de la charmante promenade qu'il m'a été donné d'accomplir à travers la réalité' (p. 377).

ART. XI.—OUR DUTY ON THE MARRIAGE QUESTION.

Tracts of the Marriage Law Defence Union. (London.)

THOSE who care for the maintenance in this country of the Christian Law of Marriage, and for the purity of domestic life, must, within these few weeks, have been agitated with strongly contrasted feelings as they heard with dismay that the Wife's Sister Marriage Bill had been read a second time in the House of Lords, and afterwards that it had been rejected in the same place on its third reading. We do not wish to dwell

upon the parliamentary aspects of the question, except to say that its political future stands better, if only the party of Christian marriage use their opportunity well, than it did before the two divisions. All, however, depends on their behaviour, for the enemy are vigilant, and angry, and animated by the true gambling spirit to struggle to retrieve their loss. While method and discipline are essential, the responsibility of action is not to be blindly left to leaders, to committees, to bishops, or to chance. Each man and each woman has his and her work cut out for them to perform. The battle was nearly lost through the apathy and ignorance of the friends of the existing law; for the portion of the population who really and actively desire the change is, we are convinced, a self-interested minority. But during the years of comparative lull since the House of Commons last entertained the question by rejecting it in 1875, the majority of mankind let themselves forget the imminent peril, although the promoters of change never relaxed from their clandestine work of sapping and mining. Having taken an active part on the side of resistance since the matter was first agitated in 1842, we have been much impressed during the last few months of activity with the widespread indications of forgetfulness which have come under our notice. There was a time when the subject secured adjourned debates in the House of Commons, and when among the writers who set themselves to show the danger of the change were found Keble and Pusey. In those days the country had marked the facts of the controversy: so the idle presumption continued that the knowledge had not died away. But now the embarrassing discovery had been made that, while instincts are still very healthy, the education of facts has to begin over again.

Accordingly the spread of information is the first requirement, and this must be done both by study and by teaching. There is no need of bulky or expensive volumes. The series of tracts handling the matter in so many lights and in accordance with so many differing prepossessions, which the Marriage Law Defence Union has with wonderful activity brought out, are for all ordinary purposes an amply sufficient library. Of course, this literary achievement has not been produced for nothing; but pleading for funds is not our present desire. Then come lectures and meetings, in both of which a good beginning has been made during the first half of the year, and must be continued with even redoubled energy. The gathering of diocesan conferences will ere long recommence, while the annals of the last season show how useful they

may be made as the mirror of respectable and religious opinion in reference to the marriage law. Women too, pre-eminently, can give most valuable help, both to each other, and generally with all classes. This is a branch of women's duties as contrasted with women's rights.

Before these words are published the Convocation of Canterbury will have again met, and we shall be much disappointed if some authoritative voice will not have issued from its chambers.

But the most important work, perhaps, is that of private influence amongst peers, members of Parliament, and other persons of weight. We are within a measurable distance of a recess which, it may be hoped, will be of normal length, so that next session is not yet upon us. This is invaluable breathing time; while that recess must not be treated as holiday time by those who are banded in the sacred cause of the defence. Petitions may not weigh much in Parliament itself, but they have a real and considerable value in their inception, as muster rolls, and as the means of concentrating attention upon the question from parish to parish and diocese to diocese. The clergyman or the squire's wife who carries round the petition carries round the opportunity of persuasion and teaching.

Our readers may have observed that the same number of the *Daily News* which recorded the result of the third reading raised the cry of 'Out with the Bishops from the House of Lords!' In plain language, this was the calculated threat of terrorizing the party of resistance by the menace of bringing the question to the alternative of capitulation or disestablishment. If this incendiary policy should be resorted to, the guilt and the recklessness will be on the side of the enemy. But we have sufficient faith in the courage of Churchmen to believe they will answer 'Neither,' and sufficient trust in their strength when united, irrespective of internal contests, in one common cause, and reinforced by all that is best among Roman Catholics, Presbyterians, and other bodies and schools, to believe that their resistance will be successful.

SHORT NOTICES.

The Pulpit Commentary. Jeremiah. Exposition by the Rev. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A., Rector of Tendring; Homiletics by the Rev. W. F. ADENEY, M.A. Vol. I. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, and Co., 1883.)

AFTER the difficult questions by which he was confronted in his commentary upon Isaiah, Mr. Cheyne must have found an 'Exposition' of the writings of the prophet Jeremiah a comparatively easy task. No difficult critical problems affecting the text have to be solved. 'The book has been preserved,' says Von Ewald, 'very much as the prophet wrote it, or rather dictated it,' and he extends this remark to the arrangement and editorial work also, going so far as to fix the compilation to a particular period of two months, which is rather a straining of probability. Only two exceptions are to be made to this *consensus* of opinion—chap. x. 1–16, and chaps. l., li. With respect to lii. indeed the matter is sufficiently clear. It is not a prophecy at all, but the fragment of a *history* of the latter days of the Judæan monarchy, either by the same hand as 2 Kings xxiv. 18–xxv. 30 or taken by a later writer from that book. As the passage is not, in fact, included in this volume we need not say more about it here. But with regard to x. 1–16, really, with deference to Mr. Cheyne, the matter as to the authorship is by no means so clear as that he should say arbitrarily (p. 267), 'Whoever wrote the prophecy in verses 1–16 of this chapter, it was not Jeremiah.' Nor does he argue the question at all adequately, but contents himself with a reference to the commentary of Nägelsbach, which not every reader may have at hand. It is clearly unwarranted to say positively that the people addressed 'are free as yet (or at any rate have freed themselves) from the guilt of idolatry.' That may be or may not be the case; and, at any rate, it does not appear on the surface. Then Mr. Cheyne apparently gives no weight at all to the surely very significant circumstance that *four* of these sixteen verses (verses 15–19) are actually repeated in a later part of the book (chap. li. 15–19). Ewald has, apparently, no doubt of the Jeremianic authorship of the passage, with the exception of verse 11 only, of which he remarks that 'it does not belong to this connection, and was probably first written only in the margin of verse 15 as a similar thought.' And surely to a critic holding the view expressed by Mr. Cheyne on p. xv. as probably true, that it was not

'till twenty-three years after Jeremiah's entrance upon his ministry that he caused his prophecies to be committed to writing by Baruch. This obviously excludes the possibility of an exact reproduction of the early discourses, even if the main outlines were, by God's blessing upon a tenacious memory, faithfully reported. But even if we adopt the alternative view mentioned in the introduction to chap. xxxvi. the analogy of

other prophetic collections (especially of those embodied in the first part of Isaiah) forbids us to assume that we have Jeremiah's original utterances, unmodified by later thoughts and experiences' (p. xv.)—

minute differences of diction in a passage from the general character of the prophecies ought not to be conclusive against it, but to admit, at the very least, of a doubt. Nor can it be said that the passage in question in any way falls below the level of the prophet Jeremiah's utterances. It is, in fact, one of the most vivid in conception and dramatic in working out of the whole collection.

Again, another subject of the very highest interest—we mean the relation of Jeremiah to the Books of Kings, of Deuteronomy, and of other parts of the Hebrew literature—is really not touched upon at all. Even in the more restricted view which the commentator *has* taken of the subject, we can hardly regard it as adequate to say that

'the Book of Deuteronomy was a favourite reading-book of religious people at this time. Jeremiah himself (surely a representative of the most religious class) is full of allusions to it; its characteristic phrases recur continually in his pages. The discovery of the book in the Temple (2 Kings xxii.) was, we may venture to surmise, providentially permitted with a view to the religious needs of those times. . . . No wonder, then, that Jeremiah himself should take up the study of the book with special earnestness, and that its phraseology should impress itself on his own style of writing.'

No doubt this is all very true in itself; but we can hardly wonder that from the point of view of the critical school this should be thought and called a begging of the whole question. To make statements of this kind in the course of a controversial dissertation is to expose oneself to a damaging retort; for Mr. Cheyne is doubtless well aware that the rationalistic explanation of the facts is very different. 'The similarity,' says Kuenen, 'is so great that some have held Jeremiah to be the author of Deuteronomy.'[1] That is of course an unwarranted inference; but having been made, it has to be reckoned with in a discussion of the question; and if such a question is taken up at all (as we do not deny was quite right and needful in a work of this kind) it should be dealt with completely and as a whole.

It is not, perhaps, a very convenient mode of publication to issue these prophecies in separate volumes, but it has, at all events, this advantage, that supplementary dissertations which are shown to be wanting in the first volume can be given in the second. We hope that when the second and final volume appears this may prove to be the case.

The Pulpit Commentary. S. Mark. Exposition by the Very Rev. E. BICKERSTETH, D.D., Dean of Lichfield; Homiletics by the Rev. Prof. J. R. THOMSON, M.A. 2 vols. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, and Co., 1883.)

EVEN in these days of many commentaries it is a pleasure to meet with a clear and reverent exposition of the Sacred Text, such as that

[1] *The Religion of Israel*, vol. ii. p. 18.

contained in the portly volumes before us. Not by any means all the contents of the volumes are, however, from the pen of Dr. Bickersteth; and some parts of the homiletics, &c., seem to us very inferior to others, on account of a certain pretentiousness and straining after effect which peeps out here and there. The 'Exposition,' we need hardly say, is the very reverse of this. It is sober and quiet almost to a fault, and the spirit of its comments is drawn in great measure from those older commentators who were at once more leisurely, more calm, and more reverent than most of the hasty writers for still more hasty readers, who have succeeded to their task in our day. They were perhaps not so *learned* as their modern successors, though the prodigious accumulation of learning in a comparatively few men, which was not unfrequently met with in those ages, does more to restore the balance of attainment than is generally imagined. Something has been gained of late years in the comparison of texts and the more exact mastering of grammatical niceties; much indeed in the illustration of the text by means of geography and all its allied sciences, by the methods of comparative history and comparative mythology. The fathers and the mediæval commentators had not these aids, in which the hermeneutic of our day disports itself with abundant complacency, and, it is fair to say, with many good results.

But, after all, such appliances are the merest fringe or outside of the subject; and wanting them, the ancient writers were driven to concentrate their attention more steadily on the text itself. It was, indeed, very possible that they might refine a text into thin air by excessive allegorizing. This was the besetting sin of the old commentators, and led them to direct their attention not to what *was* in a text, but also, and even preferably, sometimes exclusively, to what was *not* in it; and this detracts from the value of their work. But most of them had a truly spiritual insight into moral and ethical truths; and few people could read a page of any of their commentaries even now without finding somewhat greatly to their edification; whereas it would be a very rash assertion indeed that anyone would be the better, or the wiser, or anything but the more bewildered, by the perusal of the dry grammatical, critical, and philosophical disquisitions which occupy so great a part of all modern German commentaries, and from them overflow into the English works of a similar kind. In fact, the growth of the *apparatus criticus* is so enormous of late years that there will shortly have to be *specialists* in Biblical criticism as there are specialists in science; and each man will have to confine himself to his own subject, and to find life just long enough to master it.

But we have been led into this digression *à propos* of Dean Bickersteth's 'Exposition,' in which, we rejoice to see, he recurs to an earlier model. He decides, after a full and fair weighing of the evidence, strongly in favour of the last twelve verses of the Gospel. The evidence, he declares, 'as to the genuineness and authenticity of this passage seems irresistible.' The 'Analysis of Contents' seems hardly elaborate enough. It affords a mere enumeration of

events entirely without grouping. Some general conspectus of contents, such as, *e.g.*, was given by the Archbishop of York in his 'Introduction' prefixed to the Synoptic Gospels in the *Speaker's Commentary*, would have relieved the dryness of the enumeration of so many details. We observe that Dr. Bickersteth agrees with the Archbishop in regarding the name Marcus to have been derived from the Latin 'marcus,' a hammer. But if so (and the derivation, though tempting, is on the whole improbable), it must at all events have worn away all its earlier connotation, and acquired new, long before the time of our Evangelist.

Biblical Theology of the New Testament. By Dr. BERNHARD WEISS, Counsellor of the Consistory and Professor of Theology in Berlin. Translated from the Third Revised Edition by the Rev. DAVID EATON, M.A. 2 vols. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1882.)

THE idea of tracing the underlying connexions of thought embedded in the various writings which form the New Testament, and of showing wherein they coalesce and where they diverge into different tracks, is of course not a new one; and the task with which this work is occupied has several times been attempted before. Without referring to such works as those of Hagenbach, Dörner, and others, who treat the New Testament theology merely as the opening section of a more extensive subject, we may mention the very similar treatises by Van Oosterzee, J. Laidlaw, and De Pressensé. The only novelty, therefore, that can be expected in these pages is in the grouping of the facts, which are, for the most part, themselves undisputed. The author does not enter into Biblical criticism properly so called. He assumes as his fundamental datum that it has been proved that the writings of the New Testament 'are the earliest and most original monuments of Christianity.' Later works, he considers, are the products of 'the later and secondary forms of the Christian consciousness.' Their contents are a part of the gradual development of thought in historical order, and stand upon quite a different footing from those of the original documents.

It is thus interesting to find criticism coming back by the path of philosophy to the assertion of a difference *in kind* between the earlier and the later Christian writings which its earliest utterances strove to ignore; in other words, to a practical acknowledgment of inspiration.

Our author's discussion of this great question is highly able and intelligent. On the one hand he asserts, that as the writings which are contained in the New Testament were written by different authors and at different times, according to all analogy 'a variety of religious ideas and doctrines is to be looked for in them,' and that this could not be the case 'if the revelation of God in Christ consisted as to its nature in the supernatural communication of a sum of religious ideas and doctrines, whose correct transmission must also have been secured by an absolutely supernatural influence of the Spirit of God upon the writers of the New Testament. . . . That assumption,

however, has been substantially disproved by the results of Biblical theology.'

The essential character of revelation, he points out, is of a different kind. 'The revelation of God in Christ has been effected not by the communication of certain ideas and doctrines, but by the historical fact of the manifestation of Christ upon earth, which has brought to the lost, sinful world a salvation whose God-given commencement has guaranteed its completion.'

But, nevertheless, he allows that 'the writings of the New Testament are certainly the authentic records of this fact.' Furthermore he sees in them 'the immediate expression' of the religious consciousness and of the life which has been produced by the revelation in Christ, the authentic attestation of the revelation of God which has appeared in Christ.

Again, as he distinguishes his subject from the history of doctrine at large, so he distinguishes it from Biblical dogmatics. 'As the former is a historical the latter is a systematic science; as the former has to do with the variety of Biblical forms of teaching the latter has to do with the unity of the truth which is recorded in these.' This distinction, however, does not seem to be an altogether fundamental one. It consists principally in a different method of regarding the same facts. Between Biblical *theology* and Biblical *dogmatics* the only conceivable difference is this: that one is polemical and the other not; that while both of them profess to investigate trains of thought, the one follows them to their ultimate expression in this or that dogmatic formula, and the other is precluded from doing this.

Such a distinction appears to us purely arbitrary; but it has one good consequence: it saves the work from being polemical. Divested, however, of the element of doctrine (as far as was in the writer's power, which it was not altogether), the discussions of the work are more or less of an academical, or, as we may say, Platonic character. But it would seem that 'all things written' in the Scriptures are either *for admonition* (πρὸς νουθεσίαν, 1 Cor. x. 11), and to be expanded in the way of sermons, or they are intended for our *instruction*, and fall just as naturally under the head of *dogma*.

When, therefore, a book is not written with the intention of sermonizing, and expressly disclaims the examination of formal doctrine, as also criticism properly so called, it would seem that the area left to it must be comparatively small, and that even within these limits the movements of it must be vague. And accordingly something of this kind is the impression left upon our mind after perusing Dr. Weiss's treatise so far. But we do not mean to say that much may not be learned from inquiries into the sense of the sacred Scriptures conducted with learning, patience, and fairness of intention; and we are bound to acknowledge that this is conspicuously the case with these. In the concluding volume the author endeavours to formulate the doctrinal system of the four great doctrinal and controversial Epistles—the doctrine of predestination, of the Church, and those relating to eschatology. Similar headings are taken up in subsequent chapters, in regard to the 'Epistles of the Imprisonment' and

the Pastoral Epistles. The author's theory appears to be that successive stages of doctrine may be traced, in the later of which Church organization and ordinances particularly have reached a far greater degree of development. We come here and there upon traces of hesitation in the free expression of a doctrine which is nevertheless implied. Thus '*the leaders of the Church*, in so far as they discharge the duties of their office by way of a calling, are allowed . . . . to be supported by the Church.' The '*assistants of the apostle* are to exercise discipline over the presbyters, sharp but light.' What need of these periphrases to denote the unquestionable fact that there was a third order of the sacred ministry?

Section iv. deals with 'The Historical Books,' by which are to be understood the three Synoptic Gospels; and his treatment of these is clear, able, and in the main intention appears to be orthodox, though it is probable that his view that the Gospel of S. Matthew is 'artistically' constructed and furnishes 'a more artistic setting forth of the picture of the life of Jesus presented to him in the second' (p. 287) will occasion some surprise. According to this view the second Gospel, called of S. Mark, must be considered to be the earliest of all, and the original repository of the Apostolic tradition, which is the old view of Ewald, Lachmann, Reuss, and even of Meyer. The very powerful argument of Delitzsch against it must, however, be considered little less than a refutation, and Bengel, Credner, Hengstenberg, and even (of the Tübingen school) Hilgenfeld, agree with him, though upon different grounds, in rejecting it.

The characteristic habit of indistinctness of expression upon this or that crucial point comes out again on p. 299 in the sentence, 'Only in the two later Gospels also is the miraculous conception of Jesus thought of,' though it is possible that the translator is in fault here. On any interpretation the statement is inaccurate, since it follows by necessary implication from the very first chapter of this Gospel (S. Mark i. 1 and 11). A very similar remark may be made respecting a foot note on the same page: 'Only it is certain that both narratives conceived of Jesus' fasting in the wilderness as absolute (Matt. iv. 2; Luke iv. 2), although it was without doubt relative, conditioned by the situation.' It is not, perhaps, a detail absolutely vital to the narrative, but the statement is to be repudiated in any case, and we fear that there is no doubt here, as to the author's meaning, of which we can give him the benefit. But we think that the translator fails sometimes to bring out the precise meaning intended. Here, for example, on p. 310 we have 'the Epistle of the Romish Clement,' when what is meant is Clement *of Rome*; and we find in the following sentence quite a masterpiece of profundity, among the possible meanings of which we grope in vain. Of S. John's Gospel the author (or the translator) says, 'The Biblical-theological realization of the Gospel is by no means conditioned by the denial of its historical trustworthiness!' What we think he means is that it is possible to state and sum up the doctrinal meaning of the Gospel without considering its reports of matters of fact as imaginative and therefore not wholly to be trusted as historical

statements; and this is of course true; but why express it in such jargon?

To sum up our impression of this work shortly, we find in it much clearness and independence of thought, somewhat marred by indeterminateness of expression, and we are glad to note in it a piety and reverence of tone which are pleasant among the too generally arid wastes of German theological criticism. But the independence sometimes becomes crotchetiness of view, and that upon points where an agreement with received views would be desirable, and is even necessary for any extended usefulness to English students.

A Popular Introduction to the New Testament. By J. Rawson Lumby, D.D., Norrisian Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. (London: Hodder and Stoughton.)

The reader has here the substance, with additions, of twelve essays written for the *Clergyman's Magazine*. They give in a clear and accurate style just those elementary details about the several books which make up the Holy Scriptures, which all well-educated lay people should be acquainted with, but which so few of them know anything about. They are not sufficiently technical nor full of detail for the purpose of theological students, nor are they intended for that purpose. It is a *popular* introduction to the study that is aimed at, and, we are disposed to think, with a marked degree of success. The style might with advantage have been somewhat more bright and illustrative; and there are, as may be imagined, a great many matters of opinion upon which we must differ from Professor Lumby; but, setting these matters aside, we think the book very satisfactory and likely to be very useful. Many of the renderings, though not close to the *letter* of the text, are marvels of terse, vivid, and idiomatic transfusions of its *spirit* into English; and we fancy that those unacquainted with Greek would learn much from the perusal of them. There is a curious slip on p. 10: 'As soon as cursive writing became common, no new copies would be made from the uncials; *the cursive hand was so much easier to read.*'

'Even Homer,' as Horace reminds us, 'sometimes nods'; but we should have thought that no one who had ever painfully gone over a MS. in cursive Greek characters, with their undetermined shape and their innumerable and arbitrary contractions, would ever have spoken afterwards of such being 'easy to read.' It was not, we imagine, the *reader* so much as the *scribe* that was considered in that matter. The cursive character was substituted for the uncial, not because it was easier to *read* than the uncial, for it is not so, but the reverse; but because it is far easier to *write*, inasmuch as it occupies less time, gives less trouble, and requires less space.

Again, turning to p. 318 and the Introduction to the First Epistle of S. John, it is no doubt literally true to say that the words of 1 S. John v. 7 'cannot be found in any MS. of an earlier date than the eighth century.' But was it quite ingenuous to make no mention whatever of the very material fact that the words in question were quoted as Scripture *probably* by Tertullian (*second* century), certainly by

S. Cyprian (*third* century), by Phœbadius (*fourth* century), by Eucherius and Vigilius (*fifth* century), by Fulgentius and Cassiodorus (*sixth* century), and by many later writers?

Readers will not be surprised to find the readings and renderings of the 'Revised Version' generally adopted throughout the work.

Lectures and other Theological Papers. By J. B. MOZLEY, D.D., late Canon of Christ Church and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford. (London: Rivingtons, 1883.)

THIS posthumous publication of Dr. Mozley's Lectures must cause feelings of remorse in many an Oxford man who remembers how he spent his hours in the Latin Chapel while these vigorous discourses were being delivered. The best novels, the most refreshing slumber, were but a poor substitute for the close reasoning, forcible exposition, and ingenious rhetoric to which he might have listened, had he but overcome the natural disinclination to attend to a monotonous and unattractive delivery. The neglected opportunity may now, however, be partly regained by the publication of this interesting collection of Dr. Mozley's remains, the greater part of which consists of the Lectures delivered by him as Regius Professor of Divinity.

We do not, however, wish to exaggerate the importance of this volume. Those who are familiar with Dr. Mozley's other works will not find much that is new here. We do not imagine that the author would have ever published these Lectures himself; there is a good deal of repetition in them, and a certain thinness of thought, natural enough in educational discourses, but rather disappointing to the mature reader who remembers the fulness and power of the University Sermons and some of the Essays. And this comparative want of vigour in the matter is shown by the increased tendency to Dr. Mozley's characteristic fault of style—we mean the rhetorical repetition of assertions with fresh images and illustrations, but with little or no argument to support them. Even in his greater works he often suggests the thought of a barrister arguing for his brief; his rhetorical power might, we cannot but feel, be equally well exercised on the other side, and the total effect is therefore not persuasive. Dr. Mozley had so great a power of varying and accumulating his illustrations, so peculiar a fertility of exposition, that he seems sometimes to have taken repetition and restatement for proof. The image pleased him, and it pleases the reader by its ingenuity, but it is not in itself an argument, and no amount of epigrammatic presentations of it will make it an argument. There is a good instance of this tendency on pp. 282, 283 of this volume, where Dr. Mozley builds an elaborate argument on a fanciful metaphor of the 'coatings' and 'shavings' of ideas. It is this tendency to rhetoric and special pleading that weakens the force of Dr. Mozley's purely speculative writings; and he is greatest when, as in the University Sermons, he is disentangling and expounding some deep and difficult moral truth, which requires rather to be stated than proved. This volume deals chiefly with speculative subjects, and therefore does not show the author at his best. The effect produced is an impression of ingenuity, but not conviction.

The main thought that runs through these papers is one which naturally tends to a rhetorical rather than an argumentative mode of treatment. In fact, we might call it the failure of logic, or reason, to form the groundwork of religious evidence. The first lecture, on 'Evidence,' is chiefly occupied with establishing the place of 'instincts and desires' as forming 'the preliminary argument for Christianity;' the last paper, 'A Review of Cardinal Newman's *Grammar of Assent*,' supports the argument of that work, by showing that there is 'besides the reason a large, we will not call it irrational so much as non-rational, department in the constitution of the human being which is essential to the success of the rational.' But the thought reappears indirectly in several other papers in the book. 'Mysterious Truths' form the subject of one lecture, in which he maintains that such truths appeal to the feelings, though there may be 'metaphysical' reasons against them, and that 'truths which are clear and distinct .... do not in their own nature admit of being a basis of religion.' So again in arguing against the scientific appeal to the invariableness of natural laws, he points out, as in his *Bampton Lectures*, that this is only an 'intuition, a forcible impression,' and that 'nothing does produce a stronger sense of certainty in men's minds than forcible impressions for which they can give no reason.' Again, it is quite congenial to this line of thought to show, as he does in the lecture on the 'Holy Eucharist,' and in the article on the 'Colonial Church,' that many great doctrines are and must be left vague by the Church, and that the '*undefined* form' of the doctrine of the Eucharist 'appeared to our Church to be the *designed* form.' He applies this to the Colenso case with very great force and ingenuity, and declares against the 'legal principle of construction' in the sense of confining the Church to a 'naked documentary criterion.' For the principle of the inspiration of the Bible is just one of those principles which is not capable of being formally stated, but which none the less has always 'penetrated the Church,' and is utterly inconsistent with the 'critical conception of Scripture.'

Even on speculative questions, then, Dr. Mozley escapes as soon as he can from the purely intellectual point of view, and delights to investigate and expound the obscure and indefinite moral instincts that support or sometimes overwhelm reason. This is a forcible and legitimate method of evading the strictness with which men who form their ideas of logic from exact sciences attempt to apply their system to moral, religious, and historical questions. It is not, of course, original, as Dr. Mozley's review of the *Grammar of Assent* shows, and as any reader of Butler's *Analogy* will remember; and there is a later and very eloquent statement of the argument in Mr. Holland's first sermon, *Logic and Life*. Dr. Mozley's way of putting the case, however, lays him open to the charge of hardness, which he incurs, indeed, not seldom in his controversial writings. The Comtists, he says, 'are clearly without, as a felt thing, that whole foundation of mind upon which belief in Christianity arises.' This he dilates upon and demonstrates with abundant illustration; but it does not apparently occur to him to ask, Why are they without it?

He does not sympathize with his opponents enough to see that they may well retort that this want, this deficiency in certain classes of minds, is itself an argument against Christianity, a difficulty to be dealt with gently and sympathetically, and not in Dr. Mozley's triumphant and almost pugnacious manner. We do not say that the difficulty cannot be cleared up—indeed, Butler met it long ago; but Dr. Mozley does not seem to feel that there is a difficulty at all, and his method is therefore somewhat unconciliatory.

The most interesting and complete discussion in this volume is the paper on 'Jewish and Heathen Conceptions of a Future State.' We know of no better solution of the old difficulty as to the absence of any doctrine of a future life from the Mosaic law. Dr. Mozley examines the pagan ideas on the subject, and dismisses them as wholly unsatisfactory. 'It is a poor thing to say that the soul lives after death, unless you add the mode of existence.' Christianity does this. As Dr. Mozley says in another part of this volume, 'a *glorious* eternal state is the revelation of Christianity alone.' But for this conception man required training; he must be raised from his low idea of himself, and must acquire moral worth in his own eyes. This preparation was effected by Judaism. In the Jewish law, alone of all ancient faiths, morality was connected with religion; by the Jewish system alone man was convinced of sin. 'Now, this was a foundation for the doctrine of eternal life, because it was a revelation of man to himself, that he was such a being as eternal life was suitable to. It was also a revelation of God to him as a God who cared for man, was intent on improving and purifying him, made him the object of His counsels, magnified him, and regarded him with unspeakable love.' But yet the Jew stopped short. Dr. Mozley perhaps somewhat too sweepingly declares that 'no doctrine of a future state is revealed in the Jewish law, or definitely taught in any of the religious writings of the Jews till a late date.' The explanation is twofold. First, the moral condition of the Jew was not ripe for this doctrine, which required a moral preparation; and secondly, the Jewish dispensation had, like many 'schools of thought,' repressed thought. By such a dispensation man is sustained 'upon the edges of great questions, where he stops short with a trained content.' The result, then, of the whole investigation is that while paganism taught the doctrine of eternal life, but taught it ill, and taught it vaguely; Judaism did not teach it, but by its moral training laid the foundation of it. We wish we could give a less imperfect sketch of this admirable paper. Our readers should study it for themselves, and it will more than atone for any thinness or want of originality there may be in the other lectures or articles. We will find room for one extract. Dr. Mozley is arguing that the Jew's

'belief evidently stood upon the very edge of the doctrine of a future state. First, the existence of a God contained in itself the existence of an invisible world. God is not part of this world. He exists out of this world. His sole existence is therefore an existence outside of a visible nature. The Jew, in the very act of believing in God, believed in an unseen, immaterial world, in which was Will, Design, Foresight, Love,

Anger, Action; because all these belong to God. He believed in an inhabited invisible world, because God was in it, an infinite Being to whom any number of beings was as nothing. Again, there being intelligent existence out of this world, as the object of God's care he had an implicit pledge that God would continue *his* existence out of this world and not destroy him. Would love blot its object out of being? Had all been extracted, then, out of these two premisses which was contained in them, the Jew would forthwith have awakened to the conclusion of his own immortality; but inasmuch as no extracting process was applied to them, these premisses just stopped short of the conclusion; and the doctrine which trembled upon the very edge of disclosure remained latent and unexpressed. Our Lord extracted and brought to light the latent force of these premisses in the saying that "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living, for all live unto Him."'

The Life and Times of S. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of the Britains. By MARTIN RULE, M.A. 2 vols. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, and Co., 1883.)

A CHARACTERISTIC specimen both of Mr. Rule's literary manner and point of view may be found in his treatment of one of the most notable of Eadmer's anecdotes of S. Anselm. We refer to the famous case of conscience which Archbishop Lanfranc submitted to Anselm for solution, when the great thinker and theologian visited England as Abbôt of Bec, with a view of inspecting the English property of his Norman abbey. Dean Church, in his incomparable *S. Anselm*, has only devoted a few lines to the story, the original of which occurs in Eadmer's *Vita Anselmi* (lib. i. cc. 41–44.) It was probably at this visit of S. Anselm to Canterbury that the young English monk first made his acquaintance with the future Archbishop, who became his ideal hero, and whose biographer he was to become, to the good fortune of later times. Eadmer's work is so excellent, Anselm's personality comes forth with such vitality in his chapters, that the perfection of the art makes us forget the artist. But for Eadmer, the Church would never have known so exactly what S. Anselm was as a man, and it is interesting that his earliest personal reminiscence of this great primate should be the striking example of his profoundness, lucidity, and directness as a thinker in his famous solution of Lanfranc's doubts as to the valid sanctity and martyrdom of his predecessor, S. Alphege.

Canonization, even in the Western Churches, anterior to the twelfth century, was undoubtedly more of a democratic than an imperial act. As a rule it sprang from the Christian people, and was effected by a spontaneous enthusiasm, and in most cases immediately after the death of the person canonized. Doubtless the popular demand was subjected to episcopal and synodical scrutiny, and either rejected or confirmed and regulated by episcopal authority. But the validity of the claims of a local or national saint to be invoked in a particular diocese or province was not held to be uncertain until his title had been definitively examined and approved at Rome. Mr. Rule, as a sincere Vaticanist, is of course bound to hold that canonization is not properly constitutional, but autocratic; that neither a local diocesan Church, a national Church, nor even the

whole Catholic Church apart from the Pope, has the right or power to determine that any departed Christian is a saint or martyr; that the right and power to canonize is in fact a part of the *privilegium Petri*, and inherent in the Bishop of Rome. Of course no Roman Catholic historical scholar would attempt to deny that this right and power were once exercised very freely and widely by local and national Churches, and without a thought of recurrence to the Roman chair for its approbation. If such saints *are* saints—with a title as valid as that of S. Francis de Sales or of S. Peter Arbues—the Papal right and power must at some time and in some way have acted retrospectively upon every saint who was canonized before the Western Churches were taught that the Bishop of Rome could alone rightly canonize. The canonizing rights and powers which local and national Churches imagined to be inherent in themselves, subject to the approval of their bishops and synods, were nowhere more freely and widely used than they were in the Church of England prior to the Norman Conquest. William of Malmesbury says that before the denationalizing and Romanizing of the Anglican kalendar by the first foreign primate, Lanfranc, there was hardly a parish in England without its indigenous saint. 'Tota insula tantis reliquiis indigenarum fulgurat, ut vix aliquem vicum insignem pretereas ubi novi Sancti nomen non audias; quam multorum etiam periit memoria pro scriptorum inopia.' The names of national saints were erased from the kalendar, and the vacant places filled with the names of foreigners of whom the English secular priests and people knew nothing at all. Amongst the other English saints whom the Romanizing primate decanonized, or proposed decanonizing, he included one of his own predecessors, the patriotic Archbishop Ælfheah—the S. Alphege of Greenwich and London Wall. It was a happy coincidence that S. Anselm should arrive in England just at the time in which Lanfranc, that 'rudis Anglus,' as the English Eadmer curtly designates him, was hesitating about the expulsion of the name of the popular *Elfegus* from the Anglican kalendar. There must have been aged English folk still living who were children at the time in which the heathen Danes had killed the martyr Archbishop. As Mr. Rule puts it, 'Elphege had been proposed to Lanfranc for canonization; or rather Elphege having already been canonized by the *vox populi*, Lanfranc had been asked to set his name in the kalendar.' By whom he had 'been asked' Mr. Rule does not tell us; the assertion is pure guess. Even Lanfranc himself evidently did not hold that Papal intervention was necessary to confirm or reject the *vox populi Anglicani*. His own power was sufficient; he was 'revolving in his own mind,' as he told S. Anselm, the question as to the valid sanctity of these English saints. 'These English,' said he, 'have instituted for themselves certain persons whom they venerate (*quos colerent*) as saints.' The natural bias, both as a Lombard and an Ultramontanist, was against them. Unlike his greater successor, he could not acclimatize himself to English institutions, national or ecclesiastical. 'Necdumque sederant animo ejus,' says Eadmer, 'quædam institutiones quas repererat in Anglia.' Mr. Rule pays but a poor compliment to the

masculine strength and intellectual vigour of Eadmer's report of the conference between Lanfranc and Anselm when he describes it as 'one of the prettiest of Eadmer's vignettes.' Indeed, throughout his book he seems to us to have lowered one of the greatest and manliest intellects of all time, because he was a saint, to the level of the fashionable saints of the boudoir: and his *S. Anselm* reminds us of a Deschwanden's smooth and waxen altar-picture of some warrior of the Church to whom only a Michael Angelo or a Leonardo da Vinci could do justice. Mr. Rule translates a good part of Eadmer's report of Anselm's vindication of the right of the English Archbishop to the titles of Saint and Martyr: but he omits the characteristic prefatory elucidation which Eadmer himself has introduced between Lanfranc's statement of his difficulty and Anselm's solution of it. Mr. Rule's own bias seems to go with Lanfranc, who, as he tells us, 'hesitated to style him saint simply because he had lived a good life, or martyr simply because he had died a violent death.' He cites S. Cyprian's remark that it is not the 'poena,' but the 'causa,' which makes the martyr, and heaps up, after his manner, a pile of allusions to other saints—to Adrianus, Livinus, Meinrad of Einsiedeln, King Edward, and Majolus, whom he calls 'Mayeul,' which seems to indicate a debt to French sources. Eadmer expressly says that his own research in the matter 'historialiter' had brought the fact to light that the English Archbishop had already endeavoured to convert the pagans from their infidelity. This, according to Eadmer, was the prior cause (*causam antiquiorem*) of the seizure and slaughter of the English Primate. It was clearly unknown to Lanfranc at the time, or he could not have told Anselm that 'the English number him not only among the saints, but even among the martyrs, although they do not deny that he was slain, not for his confession of Christ's name, but because he would not redeem himself with money.' S. Anselm's magnificent reply to Lanfranc's 'dubietas,' which convinced that subtle thinker himself, is too well known, and has been too often cited of late years, to need being repeated here. It was substantially an extension of the range, meaning, and application of the Incarnation of the Eternal Word, which had more affinity with the productive and suggestive theology and anthropology of Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Athanasius, and the orthodox East than with the current theology of the West. It anticipated within the Church that testimony which George Fox and the Quakers were to deliver six centuries later outside the Church; it indicated, by a wonderful prophetic forecast, the future point of contact and conciliation between the unchangeable dogma of the Church and all that is generous, wide and aspiring in the most modern conception of a 'humanity.' It is a happy summary, by the profound theologian himself, of the practical and applied aspect of his great doctrinal works. It marks him distinctively as the 'theologian' in a sense which no other Western had been since S. Augustine, and which no European of the West had ever hitherto been. The late Professor Maurice characteristically inserted the whole episode in his treatise upon *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*. Of all this, however, Mr. Rule takes no manner of note.

With the nationality and patriotism which sought and found expression in England under Norman rule, as among the orthodox nationalities of the East under Turkish rule, in the life and worship of the National Church, Mr. Rule, as a Vaticanist, has naturally small sympathy. He says that 'in Lanfranc's time the uninstructed prodigality of the popular complacency had gone to such lengths that the admirers of Elphege, while promoting his canonization, took no account of one of the most important elements of the case.' Each clause of this curious sentence gives us an insight into the writer's incapacity to grasp the situation. He even fails to point out that the greatest thinker and theologian in Christendom vindicated the popular and national instinct. Mr. Rule is fond of exhibiting his acquaintance with mediæval Latin, and every now and then diverts himself with a stray shot at the Latin of the Dean of S. Paul's or some other contemporary. His own translations are not always quite so strict as he expects those of others to be. Thus, in the passage to which we have confined our remarks, Eadmer's 'per ablationem pecuniæ illorum' is rendered by Mr. Rule 'by a heavy drain upon their purse,' while he considers 'holiness of an admirably high type' to be the English equivalent of the two words 'miram justitiam,' which a schoolboy less proud of his Latin would probably render 'wonderful righteousness.'

S. Athanasius on the Incarnation. Edited for the use of Students, with a brief Introduction and Notes. By ARCHIBALD ROBERTSON, Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. (London: Nutt, 1882.)

THE *Church Quarterly Review* will not be accused of having ignored the existence of sad and distressing elements in the present condition of the English Universities. The more incumbent is it upon us to call attention to any brighter features which may tend to mitigate the gloom. There are, we trust, many such, though we cannot yet pretend to judge of their precise value, remembering how a poet and a sage have called truth 'the daughter of time.'

The appearance of this small volume is one of them. It is the work of a distinguished younger member of a band whom we once heard an able Cambridge critic specially commend on the score of their great accuracy, a commendation surely justified by such names as those of Canon Stubbs, Mr. Freeman, and the lamented Arthur Haddan. If we may judge from a specimen wrought upon a diminutive scale, Mr. Robertson's work is in no wise unworthy of the society of which he is a Fellow. Some errors of the press have indeed been overlooked, but a recently issued leaflet will enable the student to correct these for himself. Meanwhile the tyro in theological study is furnished with all that he ought to need for the thorough comprehension of a brief but most valuable sample of patristic divinity. It is, as the editor observes, remarkable that this should be probably the earliest issue in England of this treatise in a separate form.

The *De Incarnatione* is certainly a wonderful performance, especially when we consider that it was the composition of so young a man, one below the age which is fixed among ourselves as the

earliest for admission into the diaconate. It is also remarkable from having been composed before the outburst of the Arian heresy, as it shows that the general character and outline of the theology of S. Athanasius, however brought out and developed by the opposition of error, was substantially identical throughout his remarkable career.

Mr. Robertson has wisely referred his readers for the elucidation of some allusions to a few tolerably accessible works: such as, for example, Döllinger's *Heidenthum und Judenthum* in its English dress. It might prove an interesting and far from useless task for any student who had thoroughly mastered this treatise of Athanasius to compare it with some modern tractate bearing upon kindred themes. Thus, *e.g.*, a study of Prebendary Row's little volume entitled *Reasons for Believing in Christianity, addressed to Busy People*, or M. Nicholas's chapter on the Person of Christ in his *Études Philosophiques sur le Christianisme*, might enable a reader to consider whether Coleridge was not right when he intimated that the evidence for Christianity (including, of course, that for the real position of its founder) was probably stronger now than in earlier ages of the Church's history. We heartily thank Mr. Robertson for his welcome service, and trust that he may receive sufficient encouragement to induce him to lend further aid of the same valuable kind as is involved in the work before us.

A History of the Papacy during the Period of the Reformation. By M. Creighton, M.A., late Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. 2 vols. (London: Longmans, 1882.)

This is a very considerable work, and deserves very considerable commendation. The author is well learned in his subject, has a very good historical style, and writes with fairness and candour. If we are obliged to criticize some details, that does not at all imply that our opinion of the book is anything but a high one. Indeed, we believe it to be one of the most meritorious works in Church history which have appeared in England for many years. But on one point we must at the outset profess our profound astonishment. Mr. Creighton ventures upon a field already occupied by such masters in their art as Von Ranke and Dean Milman, and, so far as we have been able to discover, makes no allusion whatever to the labours of his predecessors. We think this is hardly honest. It is evident that writers of history, especially of Church history, owe very much to the labours of those who have gone before them in assistance towards taking general views, observing the connexion of events, and, above all, in finding where to look for materials. This holds good even when the precursor is an indifferent writer, or one from whom you are about to dissent *in toto*. But when Mr. Creighton has such a pilot as Dean Milman, with his graphic power, his felicitous touches, and his wide range of references, it surely was absolutely incumbent upon him to notice the assistance he must have derived from him. That this assistance was, in fact, very considerable is abundantly evident. In writing the details of so dry a subject as the history of the Popes and Councils of the fifteenth century, it is of

priceless value to the success of a book to be able to relieve the narrative with little points or touches of a humorous character, which may be picked up here and there from the chronicles and biographies from which the book is constructed. Mr. Creighton's book is not deficient in these; but almost universally, where they occur, they are to be found nearly verbatim (sometimes quite so) in the pages of Milman. We have taken some pains to compare the two, and have been somewhat astonished at the result. We do not, of course, impute plagiarism, inasmuch as both writers have evidently gone to the same sources; but we think there should have been an acknowledgment. If Mr. Creighton has written without an acquaintance with Milman, we can only say it is a most remarkable instance of undesigned coincidence.

The book opens with a well-written introductory chapter, bringing the reader up to the commencement of the Great Schism, when the subject proper begins. The characters of the Popes of this period are so repulsive, and the total absence of anything like high motives, true devotion, and unselfish religion in the leading Churchmen so palpable, that it is a sad and weary story for any historian to tell. Mr. Creighton tells it with an evident desire to be as favourable in his judgments as possible. He is always ready to suggest an excuse, or to smooth over an awkward incident, and we must pronounce him to be very distinctly a charitable historian. Sometimes, indeed, the milk of human kindness which is in him leads him into curious inconsistencies. Thus, on page 92, the logic of facts compels him to say, 'Urban VI. showed to his astonished adherents nothing save furious ill-will, unreasoning ambition, and a wild savageness of disposition;' but on the next page he relents, and speaks of 'his personal uprightness, straightforwardness, and piety.' Perhaps human nature was never more disgraced than in the conduct of the two old Popes who were degraded by the Council of Pisa, and who had evaded their solemn promises to resign by a series of lying, cheating, and chicanery. 'Christendom beheld with indignation,' says Dean Milman, 'this miserable game of chicanery, stratagem, falsehood, perjury, played by two old men, each above seventy years of age. Neither would scruple to take advantage of the other; neither would hesitate at any fraud, violence, or crime.'[1] But Mr. Creighton actually undertakes to defend the manifest perjury of Benedict XIII. :—

'Now that he was Pope he was responsible for maintaining the rights of his office. . . . If he were to abdicate, what guarantee was there that his rival should be compelled to do likewise? . . . Benedict met them with tact and prudence, and overwhelmed them with formal objections' (i. 132–3).

Of the other actor in these scandalous transactions (Gregory XII.) Mr. Creighton is able to say that he 'retained his simplicity and uprightness of character,' and upon the whole affair he pronounces this marvellous judgment :—

[1] *Latin Christianity*, vi. 64.

'It is impossible not to feel sympathy with them both, as victims of circumstances which they had no part in creating. They lamented the schism, as did others, and would gladly have seen its end; but they were bound to consider the dignity and rights of the office which they claimed to hold' (p. 197).

So that regard for the 'dignity!' of their office was to make truth, honesty, virtue, the most solemn oaths, of no account. Happily the Council of Pisa was not of Mr. Creighton's mind, but dismissed from their stations, with every mark of contempt and disgrace, these two antagonists. The sentence of the Council was:—

'The two competitors, Angelo Corario and Peter di Luna, have been and are notorious schismatics, obstinate partisans, abettors, defenders, approvers of this long schism, notorious heretics, involved in the crimes of perjury and breach of oaths, openly scandalizing the Church,' &c. &c. (Milman, vi. 72).

The Pope who next figures on the scene after the departure of these two is John XXIII. He is the hero, as is well known, of the Council of Constance. Even in that evil age it must always remain an enigma that such a man should have succeeded to the Popedom. There is no doubt about his moral character, as he himself admitted that the charges made against him were true. He had been a freebooter and a pirate. He had debauched as many as two hundred women, and had been guilty of the rape of nuns, of adultery, and of incest. These facts are all duly given by Mr. Creighton, and yet on page 301 he undertakes to exhibit extenuating circumstances, concluding the chapter with these words: 'Still it must be admitted that whatever good qualities John XXIII. possessed, they were useless to him as Pope, and his ignorance and heedlessness of the spiritual duties of his sacred office gave the Council a handle against him.' This is making things pleasant with a vengeance. So startling are Mr. Creighton's judgments of individuals that we think ourselves bound to produce the theory according to which, apparently, his judgments are formed, and which occurs in connexion with a mild excuse for the murderous burning of John Huss by the Council of Constance:—

'We cannot resist a feeling of moral indignation at such sentiments and such conduct; but the object of history is to understand before we judge the past. Freedom of opinion has been established among us of the present day by the teaching of experience. We have learned that duty has an existence among men independent of the law of the Church. Such a conception was impossible to the Middle Ages. The belief that rightness of conduct depended on rightness of religious opinion was universal, and the spirit of persecution was but the logical expression of this belief' (p. 340).

This appears to imply that right and wrong are merely conventional, and that a thing may be moral in one age and immoral in another. Perhaps Mr. Creighton, in his next volume, will furnish us with a graduated scale with dates, showing us at what periods such and such crimes are permissible, and when they cease to be so. We attribute these questionable judgments, of which there are many in the book, to

the kindness of the heart of the writer; and as everybody can rectify them for themselves from the premisses which Mr. Creighton always honestly furnishes, they are no great blot on the book. If the writer tells us that Huss's trial was fair (i. 355), why he has already furnished us with ample materials for coming to an opposite conclusion. If he informs us that Martin V. showed an unusual care in making ecclesiastical promotions, and 'did not make his appointments rashly,' he informs us almost in the next sentence that 'he conferred upon a nephew of his own, *aged fourteen*, the rich archdeaconry of Canterbury' (ii. 29).

The second volume of the book contains a laborious and exhaustive account of the interminable wrangle of Basle, the most disappointing and useless of councils. It also contains a full history of that clever knave Æneas Silvius, and the interesting narrative of his visit to England and Scotland, which is also to be found almost word for word identically in Dean Milman. It was very unfortunate for one who aspired to be a devout Pope (and who was certainly a very clever one) that there should exist in a vast number of copies an obscene romance of his writing, not the product of youthful folly, but written when the author was forty years old; and we do not wonder at the vigorous attempts of Pope Pius II. to suppress this awkward composition. The investigation of the history of these Popes and councils has led Mr. Creighton to a conclusion in which we are altogether at one with him—namely, 'the impossibility of reforming the Church from within.' In fact, so long as the monarchical idea of the Church is cherished (and the three councils of the fifteenth century did nothing to remove it, but only to transfer it), reform, by the very nature of the case, is impossible. The wisest and most prudently devised regulations can never by any possibility suit the circumstances of all nations equally. True reform must be a national movement, and not until the nationality of Churches is recognized as a condition of their healthy life can reform become general. The English Church had been always struggling for nationality, and a notable champion of this appeared in John Wycliffe, whose history it falls within the compass of Mr. Creighton's plan to narrate. We cannot perceive that he has thrown any new light upon this history, while he has certainly done something to obscure the light which had already been thrown upon it. For he rejects Dr. Shirley's happy discovery that there were two John Wycliffes at the same time in Oxford, and tries to bring back the old confusion, which would make the Reformer a member of Merton, Queen's, and Balliol at the same time, warden of Balliol and of Canterbury Hall, and all the old story about the two archbishops, one of whom was devoted to seculars and the other to regulars. These things, as Dr. Shirley says, 'are only facts by courtesy and repetition.' Mr. Creighton gives a very good account of the teaching of Massilius of Padua, from whom doubtless Wycliffe borrowed many of his views, and his general estimate of Wycliffe's doctrine is fair and judicious. That this doctrine had in it many elements of danger and disorder every candid inquirer must admit. But the extraordinarily corrupted state

of the Church at this epoch might well have induced even a less earnest man to doubt whether those who exhibited themselves so completely under the power of evil could really be considered as ministers of Divine grace. Nothing that Wycliffe ever said equals in intensity the condemnation passed by the orthodox Nicholas de Clémanges on the clergy of that period :—

'Episcopal jurisdiction is useless. Priests condemned for theft, homicide, rape, sacrilege, or any other serious offence are only condemned to imprisonment on a diet of bread and water, and are imprisoned only till they have paid enough money, when they walk away scot free. Bishops do not hesitate to sell to priests licences to keep concubines. Men who are lazy and do not choose to work, but who wish to live in idleness, fly to the priesthood; as priests they frequent brothels and taverns, and spend their time in drinking, revelling, and gambling, fight and brawl in their cups, and with their polluted lips blaspheme the name of God and the saints' (i. 264).

And yet, such being the awful condition of the priesthood, neither of the three great councils of the fifteenth century could make a serious attempt to remedy it, while they addressed themselves with eager zeal to the burning of heretics for giving the cup to the laity, and ordering the bones of almost the only honest man of the period to be dug up and burned. Mr. Creighton thus ably summarizes the results of the great Council of Constance :—

'A splendid opportunity was offered for a temperate and conservative reformation. The collective wisdom of Europe, after nearly four years' labour and discussion, was found unequal to the task. The Council shrank from a consideration of the basis of the Christian life, and mercilessly condemned Hus as a rebel, because he advocated the reformation of the Church with a view to the needs of the individual soul. When it had thus dismissed one possible form of reformation, the Council showed no capacity for amending the existing system. The decisive correction of abuses required more statesmanship and more disinterestedness than was to be found among the Fathers of Constance. There were men of keen penetration and intelligence, men who were able to criticize and to suggest points of view, but there were none who united firmness of character, strong moral purpose, and large patriotism to the interests of Christendom. Gerson and D'Ailly could write and speak with fervour about the need of reform; they came to Constance as the leaders of a powerful academic party, which had many adherents in every land. But when it came to the point, D'Ailly could not prefer the interests of the Church to the privileges of the Cardinals' College, and was found in the hour of need to be fighting on behalf of the rights of the Curia. Gerson threw himself into a small political dispute, and frittered away his influence in contending bitterly for things of no moment. No uniform policy could be obtained from the Council even in matters of detail : unanimity was only possible on the most trivial points' (i. 418).

The same hopeless story has to be told by Mr. Creighton of the Council of Pisa and the Council of Basle, as, if he perseveres in his great undertaking, he will have to tell it also of the Council of Trent. The monarchical idea of the Church is, indeed, absolutely unworkable.

We are sorry to observe in this work the affectation of recasting

the spelling of names, first, we believe, introduced by Mr. Freeman. Why should not names continue to be spelt in the way in which they have become known and familiar? Why should we write *Prag* and *Hus*, or turn the familiar Joan of Naples into Giovanna? If we are to have the correct linguistic spelling, then we must have Roma, and Napoli, and Firenze, and Gregorio, and Bonifacio. But there is no consistency in the spelling in this book. There is a curious slip at page 305, vol. i., where it is said that Arundel was translated to *S. Alban's*, an unknown see, S. Andrew's being the real place of his transference. We are not prepared altogether to acquiesce in Mr. Creighton's estimate of the result of the dispute between Martin V. and Archbishop Chichele. We do not think the haughty Pontiff succeeded in *humiliating* the English episcopate (ii. 27). On the contrary, the English Church held its own very stoutly against him, sent Bishop Flemyng, his nominee for York, back again to Lincoln, and threw his Bulls unopened into the Chancery.

Mr. Creighton proposes, 'if opportunity should be given him,' to continue his work to the dissolution of the Council of Trent. We trust this opportunity may be given, as this instalment of his considerable undertaking has excellent promise for the future. In his succeeding volumes he will be taken over ground already occupied by that most felicitous of Church historians Von Ranke. We shall be curious to see if he will ignore the labours of Von Ranke in the same calm manner in which he has those of Dean Milman. We would remind Mr. Creighton that (to use the words of Professor Schaff) 'every historian mounts upon the shoulders of those who have gone before'—that in treating so well-worn a theme it is quite out of place to affect originality.

India: What can it Teach us? A Course of Lectures delivered before the University of Cambridge. By F. MAX MÜLLER, K.M. (London: Longmans, 1883.)

THE lecturer's chief object, he tells us, was to interest candidates for the Indian Civil Service in the study of Sanscrit literature. With his general aim we undoubtedly sympathize strongly. Whatever helps to inspire the Anglo-Indian with reverence for the land in which he is to work cannot but be, so far, valuable. On this ground we are able cordially to thank Professor Müller for his vindication of the Hindus from the charge of 'untruthfulness' (Lecture ii). Really, no people in the world have been so highly eulogized by foreigners—Greeks, Chinese, Persians, and Arabs—for their love of truth. If this Second Lecture were freed from one or two blots—such as the insinuation that 'bishops and archbishops' are enemies to truth (p. 64), and the laudation of 'an excellent superstition' (p. 51), which is hardly consistent with a serious love of truth—we should be glad to see it reprinted by itself and widely circulated.

When, however, we come to ask ourselves in what way the volume replies to the question on its title-page, 'What can India teach us?' we must own ourselves to be disappointed. The answer amounts

practically to little more than this: 'India assists us to understand the religion of the early races of mankind.'

The lecturer divides the whole of Sanscrit literature into two great periods—the earlier and the later. These two periods are separated by a break of about four centuries (from the first century B.C. to the third A.D.), during which time India was ruled by some Scythian or 'Turanian' invaders. These four centuries are, in respect to Brahmanical literature, almost a 'blank' (p. 86). Then as regards the *later* literature the great mass of it is 'artificial and scholastic,' 'by no means devoid of original compositions and occasional beauty; yet, for all that, curious only' (p. 89). Thus the main stress of the lecturer's commendation is laid on the *earlier* literature, and specially on the Vedic portion of it. With regard to this he remarks:—

'That the Veda is full of childish, silly, even to our minds monstrous conceptions who would deny? But even these monstrosities are interesting and instructive' (p. 97). 'Nowhere is the light that comes to us from India so important, so novel, and so rich as in the study of religion and mythology' (p. 141).

No doubt, the facts which the diligence and erudition of Professor Müller have made known to us concerning the religion and mythology of ancient India are valuable; but we cannot think that they offer sufficient inducement to lead a busy civil servant in India to engage in many years of study for the purpose of gaining a first-hand acquaintance with them. Further, we are bound to add (and we do it with unfeigned regret) that if such prolonged study involves results such as appear in several parts of this volume, a man is incomparably better without it. We shall not go into much detail on so painful a subject. The following specimens will suffice to show what we mean.

At p. 242, after speaking of the Hindu 'worship of ancestors,' the lecturer remarks:—

'There would seem to be a higher truth than we at first imagine in the belief of the ancients that the souls of our beloved ones leave us no rest unless they are appeased by daily prayers, or, better still, by daily acts of goodness in remembrance of them.'

Again, at p. 254 he winds up his lectures by giving a quotation from Schopenhauer (who, in spite of his pessimism, is here styled 'one of the greatest of philosophic critics'). The words quoted are, 'In the whole world there is no study so beneficial and so elevating as that of the Upanishads.'

It is saddening to think that, while tens of thousands of intelligent Hindus are shaking off the tremendous errors of the Vedânta, an Oxford professor should be thus holding them up as objects of admiration to the students of Cambridge.

Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry, M.A., of Broad Oak, Flintshire, A.D. 1631–1696. Edited by MATTHEW HENRY LEE, M.A., Vicar of Hanmer. (London: Kegan Paul, and Co., 1882.)

A CONSIDERABLE portion of the public which has taken such deep interest in the romance of *John Inglesant* may be pleased to have

access to the chief contents of twenty-two diaries of one who was born in Whitehall, played with the young princes, received new coins from Laud's hands, was prepared for Holy Communion by Dr. Busby, admitted to Christ Church by Dr. Hammond, saw 'the Blow' given, and 'heard such a grone by the thousands then present as,' said he, 'I never heard before, and desire I may never hear again,' on the last Tuesday in January of his freshman's year.

The sum of these interesting passages of Philip Henry's life, and the no less curious particulars of his later years, when he declared himself a Nonconformist, and was not able (like some of his neighbours) to see his way to receiving episcopal ordination, has already been given by his son Matthew, the Biblical commentator, in a prolix account which the late Dr. Wordsworth included in the first and second editions of his *Ecclesiastical Biography* (1809, 1818), but discarded in the later editions, when he recast that work in four volumes, after Matthew Henry's account had been worked up in a separate biography by Sir J. B. Williams. One great charm possessed by the volume of diaries and letters now before us consists in this; that the editor places before us his ancestor's *ipsissima verba* in the quaint form of the original, without any of that colouring which a son, even more than other biographers, is apt to give to his father's sayings and doings; and we are here saved from all suspicion of such narrow-minded suppression of truth, as in one instance Dr. Wordsworth was enabled to point out in Matthew Henry's version of his father's description of a worthy Conformist.

Mr. Matthew Henry Lee has one special qualification in being vicar of one of the places in the district where Philip Henry ministered. The notes, which are not too numerous, show an appreciation of the diarist's piety, combined with a spirit of good churchmanship in which the Henrys (like their friend Baxter) were deficient. It is observed, however, that George Herbert is quoted by Philip Henry in one of his letters written to his son; and, again, by the son himself in his account of his father. We fancy that we have noticed also some wise sayings in the volume which *may* have been derived from Herbert's *Jacula Prudentum.*

Perhaps the most important passage of the diaries is one in which the writer described his ordination 'by the Presbytery in Shropshire' on September 16, 1657 (*æt.* 26). He had been subjected to examination or 'inquiry' in the July previous; he had preached his first sermon in Oxfordshire nearly four years before, soon after taking his M.A. degree. The record of several weeks before and after his thirtieth birthday (S. Bartholomew's Day, 1661) will be found especially interesting.

Remembering the pious phrases which are found scattered so lavishly in the diaries of men of the world in the seventeenth century, the reader will not be surprised at the constant recurrence of such language in Philip Henry's memoranda. We may well believe that with him they were something more than an affected Puritanism. However, the secular jottings strike us the more strangely. Here is a specimen (p. 107):

'Non Argus, largus, non Magdalèna, Methusal:
Non Habacuc, Lazarus, caseus iste bonus.'

We hazard this key to the enigma, without venturing to praise or blame a Welshman's taste on such a point:—

Few eyes, good size, no tears, full years:
Not rotted, but spotted, your cheese doth please.

Papers on Preaching. By the Rev. GEORGE JENNINGS DAVIES. (London: George Bell and Sons, 1882.)

MORE than twenty years ago there appeared a little volume entitled '*Papers on Preaching and Public Speaking.* By a Wykehamist.' It attracted some attention at the time, and a second edition was called for in 1864. And now, after another interval of at least eighteen years, Mr. Davies, who has been writing a series of papers on 'Successful Preachers' in the *Guardian*, has published a third edition, and dropped his *incognito*. The book, we are told, is meant to be as much the original book as possible:—

'The mind, however, advances considerably during a quarter of a century of life spent in intercourse with parishioners, and in the study of homiletic divinity. Some few crudities demand to be removed. This little book is intended, therefore, to be the same as the one I began writing a quarter of a century ago, and published twenty years ago' (p. 1).

The volume, however, has undergone considerably more alteration and addition than this opening statement would lead us to expect. It is not merely that a few crudities have been removed. Two whole chapters have disappeared bodily, viz., those on 'Secular Lectures,' and 'The Unity of the Parochial System.' No fewer than *ten* new ones have been added, with the following headings:—Two Decades of Church Progress, The Preacher's Advantages, Style, Epithets, Exordia, Divisions, Perorations, New Homilies Required, Catechizing, Conclusion; and, besides this, a tolerably large amount of new matter has been incorporated in almost every one of the remaining chapters, while omissions of passages that are out of date are not infrequent. The result is a volume containing twenty-six chapters instead of eighteen; and 396 pages instead of 268, so that, after making due allowance for omissions and substitutions, we are inclined to think that nearly one half of the book consists of new material. There can be no question that this adds greatly to its value. In 1860 it was necessary to enforce many things which are now universally accepted, while in 1883 it is possible to advocate plans which in 1860 would have been deemed chimerical. It is evident, too, that Mr. Davies' own position has somewhat changed in the interval (indeed, he confesses as much himself), and that he has grown with the times. Thus he no longer appeals with the same confidence to 1 Cor. i. 17 as an argument in favour of placing sermons above Sacraments. He quotes with approbation Dr. Hook's saying with regard to preaching, 'It is a *means of education* more than a direct means of grace,' and speaks with respect of 'the multiplication of celebrations of the Holy Communion' which has taken place 'chiefly within these two

decades.' We cannot help noticing however that he drags in and emphasizes, without any apparent reason, Hooker's unfortunate statement that 'the real presence of Christ's most precious body and blood is not to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament' (p. 12); and that on page 347 he informs us that he is writing 'for the average run of men who *enter the Church* at twenty-three'! These are 'crudities' which Mr. Davies would do well to remove before the work is stereotyped; and in spite of a few such blemishes we can cordially recommend the volume. It is written in a pleasant and attractive style, rather too discursive perhaps, as Mr. Davies is a little inclined to run off into a discourse *de omnibus rebus et quibusdam aliis* instead of confining himself to his immediate subject. But as it deals mainly with the *lighter* side of the preparation of the sermon, the fault is not so serious as it would be in a graver work, and there is certainly much that is really useful and suggestive in it. It is a book that men will read, as no one could accuse it of being 'heavy,' and it will furnish the young preacher with a number of useful hints, and show him many snares and pitfalls which he will do well to avoid, the moral being in most cases enforced by a story which is generally amusing and very much to the point. As an illustration we may conclude with the following, which is taken from the chapter on 'The Preacher's Difficulties':—

'It must be borne in mind by the preacher, that the uneducated portion of his flock are very unable to take in an argument or to remember much about a sermon, therefore the village preacher cannot be too plain. I can vouch for the truth of the following story, as it happened to a relation of my own, on Ash Wednesday, 1881. He was in the habit of receiving certain criticism on his sermon from the clerk while that official was unrobing his master in the vestry. The clerk, as an old servant, thought himself entitled to express his opinion on the discourse, what he thought, or the people thought, *Tu quid ego et populus mecum desideret, audi*, very much in the style in which Gil Blas acted as confidential adviser to the Archbishop of Grenada. It so happened that my relative that day had preached on "Fasting and Abstinence," entreating the rich to curtail any superfluities, in dress, amusements, or food. Quoth the clerk, "I am glad to hear you speak out so plainly about the doctrine of fasting, sir, *for I always knew it was very wrong!*"'

L'Instruction publique et la Révolution. Par ALBERT DURUY. (Paris: Hachette and Co. 1882.)

THE more we investigate the history of the French Revolution, the more we see how utterly unsupported by facts are the theories so laboriously put forth by the champions of the extreme Radical party. M. Taine, M. de Tocqueville, M. Wallon, M. Mortimer Ternaux, and several other writers whom it is unnecessary to mention here, have successively and successfully demolished many of the legends which had hitherto been generally accepted on the absolute worthlessness of the *ancien régime*; here is another work, composed by an author who cannot be suspected of reactionary tendencies, and who deals with one of the most important questions bearing upon the welfare and stability of society: we mean, public instruction and the intellectual and moral training of the young.

There is no doubt that during the period which preceded 1789 there were many points connected with education which required prompt and searching reform, especially so far as primary education was concerned; but still the elementary schools were numerous, and the colleges and centres of middle-class or intermediate teaching more numerous still. Six hundred and fifty-two of these colleges existed in France, besides twenty-one universities. It is easy to destroy; it is not quite so easy to reform. The Revolutionists here, as in the other branches of their work, preferred the former alternative; the abolition of tithes was decreed at first, and as these constituted the chief sources of income of educational establishments, a mortal blow was immediately struck at the establishments themselves. The professors or teachers, besides, belonged to the various religious congregations authorized in France. We do not mean to discuss here the propriety of confiding to Roman Catholic priests the monopoly of education, and if the Revolutionary party had established the principle of freedom here, there would not have been any reason to complain; but, in spite of their repeated and boasted outcry for liberty, they aimed at nothing but the re-establishment of despotism, and the *Constitution civile du clergé*, coupled with the decree of August 12, 1792, by suppressing the religious congregations, dispersed all the best-qualified educationists that France then boasted of. The *facultïes* or lectureships on divinity, medicine and law shared the same fate.

In order to fill up the gap thus left by the summary process of destruction which the Revolution had carried out, an appeal was made to the most eminent thinkers amongst the leaders of the new civilization, and a number of schemes were proposed by Talleyrand, Lakanal, Mirabeau, Condorcet, Lanthonas, Le Pelletier de Saint-Fargeau, and Romme. The common defect of all these schemes, as M. Duruy remarks, is their *à priori* character; like Rousseau's well-known *Émile*, which was then the text-book of all *philosophers*, they start from theories and not from the observation of facts; they aim at training the pattern-scholar according to an ideal which they have laboriously constructed in their own imaginings, and they fondly and seriously suppose that things, such as they are, will adapt themselves without the slightest difficulty to their absurd conceptions. M. Duruy has analysed the principal amongst these plans; although they were all tainted by the theorizing mania we have just noticed, some of them (Mirabeau, Talleyrand) retained a quasi-religious character; Condorcet leans towards materialism, and Jacob Dupont, the Girondist, throwing off the mask, proclaims atheistic principles. These were finally adopted as the natural result of the new *régime*. A commission of nine members, appointed to discuss the educational programme, boldly suppressed liberty of teaching, and the *laïcisation* of the schools, so dear to Messrs. Paul Bert and Jules Ferry, became law.

It is impossible to describe the state of confusion which followed these ridiculous measures; the *central schools*, as they were then called and which corresponded to the colleges and Lycées of the presen

time, were reduced to the condition of Augean stables, where disorder reigned supreme; the subjects of instruction, dissociated from each other, might be studied or not, *ad libitum*, according to the special tastes of the pupils, and, we need scarcely say, all traces of religious instruction were carefully and scrupulously dismissed. Instead of the Church Catechisms and the old spelling-books, we find *L'Alphabet des sans-culottes*, the *Nouveau calendrier républicain*, the *Almanach du Père Gérard*, compiled by Collot d'Herbois, &c. It was now a fundamental axiom that the child belonged to the State and not to the family; agreeably to this principle, Grégoire, the constitutional Bishop of Blois, proposed seriously that a manual should be drawn up for the use of primary schools, giving plain instructions as to how children should be tended and watched from the period of the mother's pregnancy till their admission into the national establishments of education!

M. Duruy's work is full of the most valuable details on all these subjects. The narrative of the iniquitous steps taken by the Revolutionary Government would alone prove the absurdity of endeavouring to do away with religious education; but M. Duruy is not satisfied with leaving facts to speak for themselves; he takes care to enforce as strongly and eloquently as he can the terrible lessons which these facts contain, and when we examine the state of France at the present time, when we see how, in spite of the verdict of history, the theorists of 1883 are repeating the errors of 1793, we may well exclaim to our Gallican neighbours, *tua res agitur*. For as the educational scheme devised by the National Convention led, under the Directoire, to universal disorganization, and to a reaction which nothing could oppose, so, unless we are very much mistaken, the blunders of M. Jules Ferry and M. Paul Bert must inevitably bring about with them their own condemnation.

M. Duruy has been actuated throughout his work by the spirit of impartiality. That the Revolutionary rulers of France did a few wise things in the matter of public instruction no one would deny; the Paris Museum of Natural History, the Polytechnic School, and the School for the Teaching of Oriental Languages are their creation, and the good results they have produced are still apparent. Where the Conventionalists signally erred was, as we have already said, in trying to root up the foundations of all true education, and to replace the everlasting principles of Christianity by the destructive influence of philosophy so-called.

Platon à l'Académie, fondateur de la première école de philosophie en Grèce. Par C. HUIT. 8vo. (Paris: Thorin, 1882.)

M. L'ABBÉ HUIT, Professor of Literature at the Paris Catholic Institute, has recently published an interesting *brochure* on Plato and the foundation of the Academy. What was the spirit of philosophical teaching originally, and up to the death of Socrates? What circumstances led Plato to establish his school, and helped him in the realization of his plan? What was the character of the Academy, the nature of the instruction delivered there, its *programme*, if we may

so say, and the scheme of its administration? Such are the questions which M. Huit has undertaken to answer.

In the first place we must remark that during the period anterior to Plato there was no school of philosophy properly so called. Of course thinkers such as Thales, Anaximenes, Anaximander, &c., were anxious to see their views adopted by as many of their contemporaries as possible; they wanted to see grouped around themselves a band of disciples sharing their opinions and zealous in propagating them. But this has nothing whatever to do with *ex-professo* lecturing, and a society resting upon metaphysical sympathies is not necessarily a school. Plato was endowed with the gift of teaching, and his intellectual acquirements were of so varied a nature and so wide a grasp that they could not remain fettered by the comparatively limited and casual resources of conversation.

'He brought to the world' (we quote M. Huit's remarks), 'or at any rate his ambition was to bring to the world, a complete system of philosophy, all the parts of which, in perfect harmony with each other, derived from each other light and strength. A regular, consecutive scheme of instruction was alone capable of blending together so many grave problems, and bringing out this close connexion. And then what an aspiration towards the ideal! What constant efforts to reach the highest summits accessible to thought! What contempt for the low results of everyday experience! When we read the most celebrated pages of the *Republic* and the *Banquet*, how far we are from the familiar tone of those Socratic conversations which have found in Xenophon their faithful echo! The multitude was not capable of understanding deductions so high and so deep at the same time; it could not follow step by step the philosopher in his austere speculations, which seemed like a voice from the invisible world. Such teaching suited none but chosen disciples prepared by a real initiation.'

M. Huit goes on to say that the praiseworthy desire of combating more efficaciously the dangerous influence of the Sophists further accounts for the foundation of the Academy; and we think it useless to suppose, with certain authors, that this creation was the result of a feeling of spite on the part of Plato, disappointed in his dreams of social regeneration. He saw clearly, no doubt, that a period of decay had come for his native country, and he was convinced that he would render far greater services to the Athenians by educating them than by taking a part in politics and aspiring to the *rôle* of a Solon or a Lycurgus. But although he believed that the renovation of society was impossible at Athens, he thought that such a thing might be realized elsewhere, and we have here a natural explanation of his residence at the court of the tyrant Dionysius. At any rate, matured by the experience which is the result of travels, he returned to Athens, and made it by his learning and his eloquence the intellectual centre of the world.

One of the most interesting sections in the pamphlet we are noticing here is the one which refers to the topography of the Academy. M. Huit has collected carefully together all the details he could find in Plutarch, Diogenes, Laertius, Strabo, Xenophon, Cicero, and other writers. It was a curious notion of Ælian, quoted

with commendation by S. Jerome and S. Basil, that the reason which induced Plato to select the Academy as the place for his school was its very unhealthiness. The pupils who flocked around him would thus be prevented from bestowing upon the body the energy and attention which ought to be exclusively reserved for the training of the mind and the education of the soul; and lacking the opportunity of perfecting themselves as athletes, they would be almost compelled to become metaphysicians. Another quaint fancy is that of the mediæval scholar John of Salisbury, who in his *Polycraticus* states that earthquakes being of frequent occurrence in the neighbourhood of the Academy, Plato dexterously availed himself of the apprehensions which these phenomena created for the purpose of enforcing upon his hearers the duty of distrusting their own strength and controlling their passions—'ad incutiendum timorem quo vitia reprimerentur.'

M. Huit has devoted a few pages to the question whether the subject of his *brochure*, like the Egyptian priests, like Pythagoras and other founders of schools, had an esoteric teaching independently of that which he gave to all his pupils. The affirmative has been maintained by Tennemann and Böckh in Germany, whilst Schleiermacher and Steinhart have taken the opposite view. The ἄγραφα δόγματα alluded to by Aristotle would seem to justify the former of these hypotheses, but our author says, with much probability, that Plato need not be supposed to have been a mystagogue or a hierophant, because he developed more fully before his regular and assiduous disciples the doctrines which he merely gave in outline to the casual hearers attracted by his reputation. If that character has been ascribed to him the reason is obvious. At the time when Christianity made its appearance as a system of ethics and of theodicy, Plato's opinion was appealed to both by heathen philosophers and doctors of the Church; and as both parties could discover nothing in his known works to justify his being classed amongst quasi-inspired teachers, they invented or conjured up a fictitious Plato, to whom they ascribed the theories which suited them best; and it is not too much to say that the vagaries of Jamblichus, Plotinus, Damascius, and Proclus are no more expressions of Plato's thought than President Edwards' fatalism is like the doctrine of Calvin.

The concluding section of M. Huit's essay is taken up by a history of the word *academy*. The museum of Alexandria might have assumed that designation, but it appears not to have done so; Cicero's villa was only an academy by name; later on we find the society which numbered amongst its members Eginhard, Alcuin, Rhabanus Maurus, and other learned men of the ninth century styled the *Palatine Academy*, although the term is not used by contemporary chroniclers. The *Platonician Academy* founded at Florence by Marsilio Ficino and Picus Mirandulensis, the Venetian Academy which Aldus Manutius established at Venice in 1500, the various *académies* which constitute the *Institut de France*, are instances which might be quoted; but none of them recalls, except in the faintest possible way, the school so indissolubly connected with the illustrious disciple of Socrates.

Lambeth Palace and its Associations. By J. CAVE BROWNE, M.A. With an Introduction by the ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY. (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1882.)

A MONOGRAPH of Lambeth Palace, embodying the discoveries of history, archæology, and ecclesiology, as these sciences are now studied, would be a valuable contribution to ecclesiastical literature. Excellently intentioned as Mr. Cave Browne is, and painstaking in his researches within the limits which he appreciates, we cannot say that he supplies this desideratum, for with all his laborious manipulation of old-fashioned authorities he shows but a superficial acquaintance with modern discoveries in the fields of historical and ecclesiastical study. The plan too of his work is bewildering. Each portion of the building is taken separately, so the consecutive history of Lambeth as a whole is wanting, while dates come and go without appreciable sequence. We are able to gather from his notices, although the writer seems himself to be insensible to the fact, how great a loss archæology sustained when Mr. Blore was allowed, about half a century back, to make a clean sweep of the old domestic portions of 'Lambeth House' (only dubbed 'Palace,' as Mr. Cave Browne pertinently remarks, within the living century), in order to replace them by that monotonous pile which lies adjacent to so much of the ancient buildings as still survives.

Of the illustrative woodcuts we can speak with praise; but we regret that there should be nothing better by way of frontispiece than a coarsely executed chromograph giving a very inadequate idea of the chapel as it now appears, enriched with Archbishop Tait's decorations. This gem of the First Pointed style was constructed by Archbishop Boniface in the middle of the thirteenth century, and received a famous adornment of painted glass during the archiepiscopate of Cardinal Morton, at the end of the fifteenth century. Laud, when promoted to the primacy, not only repaired Morton's glass, but fitted the chapel with boldly carved stalls and a screen of Renaissance design. The triumphant Puritans smashed the glass, and dug up Archbishop Parker's remains, which they put under a dunghill, but, strange to say, did not demolish or deface Laud's woodwork. Archbishop Howley replaced the flat ceiling by imitative groining in plaster, under Mr. Blore's superintendence. It was left to Archbishop Tait to set up a strictly ecclesiological altar, and to call in Messrs. Clayton and Bell to reinstate the painted glass of Morton and Laud, and to decorate the roof with elaborate painting. Happily Laud's woodwork was not interfered with, so that Lambeth Chapel is now the monument of the two most prelatic archbishops who have filled the throne of S. Augustine since the Reformation. The elaborate list which Mr. Cave Browne gives of all the bishops consecrated at Lambeth, with their previous posts, and their translations, if any, is a very useful contribution to Church history. The book is prefaced by a kindly worded introduction from the pen of Archbishop Tait, presenting with much picturesqueness of language the conventional idea of the manor of Lambeth as identified with the see of

Canterbury. The man who drew his knowledge from this might not fully appreciate that some six hundred years of the life of the metropolitical see had passed before the Archbishops of Canterbury thought of building a house opposite the King's palace at Westminster.

Christchurch Cathedral, Dublin. Account of Restoration by G. E. Street, R.A. Historical Sketch by EDWARD SEYMOUR, Precentor. (London: Sutton Sharpe and Co., 1882.)

AMONG Mr. Street's successes in ecclesiastical art none was more brilliant than the work of mixed restoration and construction, so dear to an architect's heart, which Mr. Roe's boundless munificence enabled him to carry out in Dublin in the pile of buildings comprising the renovated Cathedral of Christchurch and the new Synod Hall for the Irish Church. It is with much pleasure that we find the undertaking commemorated in a volume not only magnificently printed and illustrated, but also full of valuable information comprised both in Mr. Seymour's historical and in Mr. Street's architectural essay.

When in the crisis of disestablishment in 1871 Mr. Roe's offer was made, Christchurch, the elder but hitherto the less fortunate of the two Dublin cathedrals, was on the point of collapse, both as an institution and as a building, while S. Patrick's was prospering in Mr. Benjamin Guinness's unsatisfactory but costly restoration. Now it is the recognized cathedral of the see of Dublin, S. Patrick's having become a so-called 'national cathedral' of the whole Irish Church. Before it had passed into Mr. Street's hands Christchurch had nothing of beauty to show, except a First Pointed north arcade of the nave, which presented, though sadly mutilated, a combination of triforium and clerestory worthy, like the west front of Dunblane, to be reckoned among the great inspirations of mediæval art, and a Norman south transept. The south side of the nave was a blank wall, for the roof had fallen and crushed the old arcade and aisle in Elizabeth's days. The north transept had disappeared, and the choir was a long shapeless rectangular room, measuring 102 feet in length, with a twist in the middle, which had been substituted for the original apse in the fourteenth century, and since then had been disfigured and misfitted past recognition. Fortunately a crypt survived, which gave Mr. Street the plan of the original apse with an eastern aisle and three square-ended chapels. All of these have reappeared, contributing beauty and dignity to the cathedral in exchange for useless length. The north transept is there, and also the south arcade and aisle of the nave, while a central tower of correct design replaces a modern abortion. In one word, restored Christchurch, although of small dimensions for a cathedral, is now as a whole a monument of First Pointed architecture, of first-class excellence, only varied by the Norman transepts.

The internal feature which will attract most attention, from its connection with recent Church history, is the choir screen of stone and marble, with its cross copied from the famous old cross of Cong. Nothing could be more unquestionably legal than this construction,

but that unreasoning Puritanism which has done so much harm to our Church in Ireland fastened upon it, and it provoked a debate in the synod of the Irish Church. Happily the attack failed, thanks in the main to the tact and ability of that wise prelate and statesman to whom in this, as in other perils, the Irish Church is so much indebted for her safety in the present and hopes for the future, Primate Beresford of Armagh.

Glossaire archéologique du Moyen Age et de la Renaissance. Par Victor Gay. 1er fascicule, A–BLI. 4to. (Paris: Maurice Tardieu, 1882.)

We have the greatest pleasure in announcing that the first fasciculus of M. Gay's long-expected *Glossaire archéologique* has appeared. It is a work upon which the learned author has been engaged for twenty years, and it commends itself not only to antiquarians and artists, but also to the wider circle of students who would know thoroughly the manners and customs of European society during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. The new edition of Ducange's *Glossary*, now in course of publication, M. Godefroy's *Historical Dictionary*, the first volume of which has recently appeared, Roquefort's *Glossaire de la Langue romane*, are all admirable in their way; but M. Gay's compilation, besides exhibiting the progress and development of the French language, is, in addition, a history of art and, as a matter of course, is profusely and beautifully illustrated. Let us quote a paragraph or two from the author's preface :—

'This archæological store-house of the Middle Ages and of the Renaissance, arranged in the form of a dictionary, will give, besides the explanation of the various terms introduced, a series of more than thirty thousand original quotations, together with engravings representing contemporary monuments, a considerable proportion of which had never appeared before. It is not, strictly speaking, a history, but a kind of conspectus, where will be often found, together with the meaning of words obsolete at the present day or imperfectly explained, the pictorial representation of the objects which those words express. Collectors and curiosity-mongers will also have on these objects historical particulars they require. Exclusively borrowed from original sources, the glossary contains in a series of five thousand words all the interesting or imperfectly known details we have been able to discover on literature, history, arts, and sciences during a period comprehended between the Carlovingian epoch and the Renaissance.'

Each article is conceived on the following plan :—1st, the precise definition of the object; 2nd, a brief historical description; 3rd, the drawings and texts, arranged in chronological order, which illustrate the object, show its nature and its design, and account for its various transformations. Thus under the word *ampoule* the definition comes first, and then its history, including a mention of the principal *ampullæ*, such as the holy one preserved at Reims; seven sketches of specimens chosen from well-known museums are introduced next; and finally we have a catena of original texts extending from the year 1180 to the year 1485. The words *ablution*, *absconce*,

absolution des morts, Agnus Dei, aigle (lectern), *bâton de chambre, amict, aumusse,* are good samples of M. Gay's erudition ; the article 'Autel,' extending over four columns of small print, is illustrated with three woodcuts.

La Messe : Études Archéologiques sur les Monuments. Par CH. ROHAULT DE FLEURY, Auteur du Mémoire sur les Instruments de la Passion. Continuées par son Fils. (Paris : Morel & Cie.)

WE do not wait for the completion of this work to bring it under the notice of our readers, for the reason that M. Georges Rohault de Fleury, who modestly describes himself as continuing his father's labours, is circulating a *Demande des Renseignements* as to photographs, engravings, or other means of accurate information about ancient altars, vessels, vestments, miniatures in missals or other service-books of scenes connected with his subject—as a rule, not later than the twelfth or thirteenth century, though no information would come amiss. Our readers may form some idea of the extent to which he is prepared to carry his illustrations from the fact that 250 plates bearing on that part of the work which is concerned with the *monuments fixes* are already completed, whilst the other *monuments*—we sadly want the word in English which shall include a cathedral and an illuminated initial in an early manuscript—are still awaiting the burin of the engraver, and the kindly assistance of brother archæologists.[1] But we must say a few words as to the work itself, and the author. We have had the advantage of examining a portion which has passed through the press—92 pages of letterpress, illustrated with wood engravings, and 22 copper plates, the subject being the 'Celebration of Mass.' We have not, indeed, the documentary evidence collected with such learning and honesty by those grand old French Benedictines of the seventeenth, or their German brother Gerbert, Abbot of S. Blaize, in the Black Forest, in the next century ; nor have we the liturgical essays of Thiers, Grancolas, Le Brun des Marettes, and other French ecclesiastics, who indulged to the full their love for their Gallican liberties, and never wrote with more apparent satisfaction than when dwelling on the local Uses of French dioceses. Our author and his earlier predecessors in travelling over much the same ground took a very different point of departure and had different objects in view. He was a layman, and like many of the religious-minded French laymen of the present day was drawn to the Roman see and everything Roman with unmixed devotion. Those older ritualists could not, and did not, forget the religious aspect of their learned labours, but his was simply and only as a service to the Church. In 1820 he passed at the Ecole Polytechnique with great distinction, and became a civil architect. At the age of sixty, having by this time become decorated with the Grand Cross of the Legion of Honour, he retired from the work of his profession, in which he had reached the leading position, and henceforth devoted his well-earned leisure and his ample means

[1] A foreign post-card would reach M. Rohault de Fleury, 12 Rue d'Aguesseau, Paris ; and we may add that he understands English, though we believe he likes to be told he may answer in French.

to the service of the Church. We must not now speak of his other 'iconographical and archæological' publications, which bear the marks of his artistic knowledge and general culture. His death, in 1875, cut him short in the preparation of *La Messe*, which his son is now continuing as a work of filial devotion, in the same devout spirit, and with the same ungrudging expenditure. We understand it will extend to two volumes, and no doubt its interest will be greatly enhanced by the preface and introduction, which as usual await the completion of the work. It starts with the present Roman order of Mass, with translated rubrics, and its professed object is to illustrate it as it stands, from *monuments*, as distinguished from the text of manuscripts. If we seem to miss the Gallican freedom and the varied information of the earlier writers, there is a richness and extent in the illustration of which they never dreamt; whilst there is none of that disingenuous glosing over discrepancies and difficulties which discredits many of the more recent Ultramontane writers on these subjects.

Every country and every source has been placed under requisition; mosaics, frescoes, statuary, stone and wood carvings, ivories, enamels, paintings and miniatures, in addition to careful drawings, to scale, of existing objects, bring everything before the student's eyes. On some controverted points the illustrations tell their own story: for example, 'the change as to the orientation of altars,' as our author calls it, in the thirteenth century. Until then we see the celebrant standing beyond the altar—they then called it *before* (*ante*), where a modern ritualist, ignorant of the facts, might have been disposed to call it *behind*; much as a couple of centuries later, they began to call north of the altar, *right*, when before it was the *left*—and we are thus enabled to understand the several forms of the Roman *Ordo* at a glance. We shall hope to return to the subject, and meantime we promise our readers a rich ecclesiological treat even in that small portion of M. de Fleury's labours which as yet has been committed to the press.

Five Minutes' Daily Reading of Poetry. Selected by H. L. Sidney Lear. (London: Rivingtons, 1882)

In her preface to this little volume Mrs. Sidney Lear explains that it has its origin in her remembrance of 'a celebrated man,' who told her father that he was in the 'habit of daily learning by heart a few lines of poetry before leaving his dressing-room in the morning; and, he observed, it was astonishing what a useful stock of verses he had in that way collected. Perhaps this book may suggest some such habit to those who take it up.' Whether the example here cited be literally followed or not, there can be no doubt that the idea of providing a few verses of really good poetry for daily reading is a happy one; but to carry it out is a matter requiring a good deal of thought and discrimination, and we cannot help wishing that Mrs. Sidney Lear had bestowed on this task the minute and studious care which is exhibited, for instance, in Archbishop Trench's beautiful compilation, *A Household Book of English Poetry*. Of course any selection of

poetical extracts will involve questions of taste, as to which, proverbially, there can be no disputing; nor should we, for our parts, care to complain of the omission of passages which might chance to be favourites of our own. Criticism of that kind would be endless, and nearly profitless. But we find, to our regret, not a few tokens of heedlessness, if we may use that term to indicate our meaning. The same stanza from Archbishop Trench—unquestionably well worth reading and committing to memory—is prescribed for February 8 and July 12. Mr. Browning is quoted at p. 97 as having written in the poem called *The Boy and the Angel*, 'God said, "A praise is in thine ear."' This makes nonsense of the context; the poet wrote 'in *Mine* ear.' At p. 360 a strange liberty is taken with *Paradise Lost*; an extract from the eleventh book is introduced as beginning, 'Who could dry-eyed behold? Adam could not,' &c., in disregard, we must say, at once of grammar, sense, and accuracy. Milton has been picturing a 'lazar-house,' and he proceeds—

> 'Sight so deform what heart of rock could long
> Dry-eyed behold? Adam could not,' &c.

Milman is twice misused in extracts from his noble and too little known poem, *The Fall of Jerusalem.*

At p. 111, for April 28, we find an extract from Crabbe, called *Suggestions as to Preaching.* It comes from the poem called *The Squire and the Priest.* Crabbe exhibits a profligate squire addressing a young clerical nephew whom he has just presented to the family living, and in whom he discovers an inconvenient earnestness. The purport of this address is, 'Speak unto us smooth things.' The uncle introduces it with—

> 'Treasure these hints, if fame or peace you prize;
> The bottle emptied, I shall close my eyes.
> On every priest a twofold care attends—
> To prove his talents, and ensure his friends.'

His preaching should be learned and orthodox; he is to preach the orthodox faith, but not a faith that implies strictness of life—not a faith that would sever unlawful connections (such as that to which the squire himself is addicted); he is to be careful not to give offence—to attack vice only in the abstract, except in the case of poachers and drunkards, &c. It is strange that Mrs. Sidney Lear should select the main part of *these* 'suggestions as to preaching,' torn out of their context—although, indeed, their ironical purport must be tolerably evident to her readers—when she might have quoted Cowper's lines beginning, 'Would I describe a preacher such as Paul.' She gives us eight extracts from Crabbe, and we are glad of most of them: the poet whom Scott and Newman so much admired, the realistic painter of life even in its hardest and least attractive aspects—he, so stern and yet so tender, so pathetic in his austere truthfulness, is, we fear, too little studied now. The omission of Adelaide Procter's name after 'Be strong to hope, O heart,' is unaccountable. It must be added that if, as we presume, this book is intended for English Church people, there is no reason why a series of stanzas setting

forth the Roman doctrine of Purgatory should be recommended for December 17, even though those stanzas bear the name of Newman; nor why, on November 13, we are to read of 'murmured Aves' for the dead in verses by Faber. We have dwelt on flaws which might easily have been excluded; but it is needless to say that the volume contains many charming extracts, which deserve to be read frequently; and among these must be included some which were previously unpublished.

Theologische Literaturzeitung. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich.)

THE new year begins with a highly commendatory notice of the Rev. J. A. Cross's *Introductory Hints to English Readers of the New Testament* (Longmans). The scholarship, and above all the clearness of arrangement, are especially picked out for praise.

Running through the three first numbers there is an article by K. Müller on the *Latest Researches into the History of the Inquisition.* The conclusions come to by the writer are briefly as follows: (1) That there seem to have been no punishments for heresy beyond ecclesiastical censures until the end of the tenth century. (2) That from that period onwards temporal punishments were inflicted in northern Europe originally in accordance with popular expressions of opinion, and in opposition to the mind of the Church; in the south, more at the instigation of the clergy and especially of Innocent III. From that date there would seem to be but little difference between the north and south, and none whatever in the methods of punishment used by the Inquisition. The fact that the heretical sects were so numerous in the eleventh and twelfth centuries as to need an Inquisition for their suppression speaks volumes for the fact that the pre-Reformation Church was quite as unable as the post-Reformation has been to save the faithful from heresy and schism. Probably some of the fanatical sects of the Middle Ages were quite as ignorant and extravagant as our own Salvationists. This is brought out prominently by a book which is reviewed in No. 9, Haupt's *Die Religiösen Sekten in Franken vor der Reformation* (Würzburg: Stuber), which, although professedly dealing only with local sects, is yet of far more than local value.

Other books on ecclesiastical history are Klasen's *Innere Entwickelung des Pelagianismus* (Freiburg: i. B. Herder), a book of which Dr. Harnack speaks most highly; Preger's *History of Mediæval German Mysticism* (Leipzig: Dörffling and Franke); Nielsen's *Aus dem inneren Leben der Katholischen Kirche im XIX. Jahrhundert* (Karlsruhe: Reuther); and a review of vol. i. of Schaff's *History of Christianity*, which is also highly spoken of.

As the fourth centenary of Luther's birth will be celebrated in November of this year, great efforts are being made to publish by that date a revised version of the Bible, based on Luther's version. The same hopes and fears, objections and counter-objections, are evidently at work in Germany and in England, except that in England our minds are a little more at ease, as we know now what to expect.

In the department of Scriptural criticism we have Klöpper'

Der Brief an die Colosser (Berlin : Reimer), which, without seemingly adding much to the general stock of knowledge, is yet highly spoken of as a painstaking and useful book. Nösgen's *Commentar über die Apostelgeschichte des Lucas* is described as being conservative in its tendency. It makes a great point of the ἀκρίβεια which S. Luke claims for himself in the preface to the Gospel, and shows that that accuracy is in no way impaired by the fact that several of S. Paul's speeches are not verbatim reports, but reconstructed from memory. The speeches in Thucydides do not detract from the trustworthiness of that historian. They rather enhance the value of his work. Professor Nösgen's book seems to be worthy of attention.

In patristic literature we have notices of editions of Nonnus Panopolitanus, Bede, Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, Hermæ Pastor, Ennodius, Salvianus, &c., but none of these books seem to call for special notice. There is a notice of a somewhat peculiar brochure, Holsten's *Die drei ursprünglichen noch ungeschriebenen Evangelien* (Karlsruhe : Reuther). It supposes that the Gospel took as it were three types : (1) the *Petrine* type, as preached by S. Peter and the other Apostles in the early days of the Church ; (2) the *Pauline* type, as we know it in the Epistles of S. Paul ; (3) the *Judaizing* type, a reaction against the Pauline Gospel, under the leadership of S. James. This third type seems to have made considerable headway at first, and to have succumbed finally only in consequence of the destruction of the Temple. The pamphlet goes on to connect the three original forms of the unwritten Gospel with the three Synoptics, and labours to prove that S. Matthew represents the original Petrine form of the preaching, S. Mark the Pauline, and S. Luke the Judaizing Gospel of S. Paul's opponents ! Truly at first sight it almost seems as though there were some new thing under the sun !

Notices of New Books, New Editions, Sermons, Charges, Pamphlets, &c.

Those who know the value of Bishop Andrewes' *Devotions* will welcome a beautiful edition of the work (London : Suttaby and Co.) in large type, edited by Precentor Venables, with a Preface by the Bishop of Ely, who were both of them educated at Merchant Taylors' School and Pembroke College, Cambridge. The Bishop quotes a most true remark once made, ' Pray with Bishop Andrewes for one week, and he will be thy companion for the residue of thy years.' The manly vigour of these Prayers would be a relief to many who are wearied with the sentimentality of many modern manuals of devotion.

Dr. Liddon has published some *Prayers for a Young Schoolboy*, by Dr. Pusey (Rivingtons). They were written for Dr. Pusey's only son, and will be useful in many families. Many will value a volume of *Devotions for Holy Communion*, with an introduction gathered from the writings of Dr. Pusey (London : Walter Smith). The compiler is Dr. Pusey's daughter, and there is a Preface by Canon Jelf.

Meditations, by Canon King, on the Last Seven Words (A. R. Mowbray and Co.), may be safely recommended. Mr. Wollaston's

Good Friday at Cannes (London: Rivingtons), Addresses on the Seven Words, are so little original that they were scarcely worth publication. The Bishop of Lincoln's *Guides and Goads* (Rivingtons), on the other hand, are truly admirable—pithy thoughts pithily expressed. A pastoral staff, embossed on the cover, reminds us that a shepherd goads as well as guides.

Among Sermons we note one by Mr. R. F. Wilson, entitled *A Sanctifying Purpose the Secret of Success* (Rivingtons), and one by Mr. J. W. Irvine, preached and published at Colchester, the title of which, *Temperate Words upon the Temperance Question*, sufficiently describes it.

Archdeacon Norris, of Bristol, publishes two *Charges* (Rivingtons), in which he discourses of the offices of an archdeacon and of churchwardens and sidesmen. We wish he had said something about the qualification for the latter offices. He finds a precedent for a 'parochial council' in the 'elders' whom S Augustine addressed in A.D. 404, when he wrote 'Clero, *senioribus*, et universæ plebi ecclesiæ Hipponensis.'

The Legacy of Peace is the title of Archdeacon Harrison's *Charge* to the Archdeaconry of Maidstone (Rivingtons). Of course, it deals with the late Archbishop of Canterbury's action with respect to the prosecution of Mr. Mackonochie. There is an admirable note, however (*Note E*), on the Wife's Sister question. It is much to be desired that some one should collect and tabulate (if possible) the many able arguments on this most burning question, which, we rejoice to see, almost every diocese is contributing to the common cause.

The vigorous and characteristic *Charge* of the Archdeacon of Taunton (Parker, 1883) says something that is new and valuable on the Deceased Wife's Sister question. He points out that the ordinary use of the English language from the earliest times expresses kindred created by marriage by the two words 'in law.' In what law? it may be asked; and the answer still is, In the law of God and of man. The phrase 'sister-in-law' will have no meaning in a civil sense should human law determine that a man's wife's sister is *not* his 'sister-in-law.'

Archdeacon Hannah, of Lewes, deals admirably with the Deceased Wife's Sister question in his *Address* (Brighton: Treacher), delivered at his sixth visitation.

In *Worship and Order* (J. Murray), Mr. Beresford Hope issues, in a collected form, his scattered papers on Diocesan Organization and Phases of Worship, his reply to Dean Howson's *Before the Table*, his essays on the Ridsdale Judgment and Lord Selborne's controversy with Mr. Parker, and on the Peace of the Church. Many persons will be glad of this volume. In particular, it makes accessible the curious ground-plan of Bishop Andrewes' private chapel, only to be found—except in the *Life of Andrewes*, in the Anglo-Catholic Library—in the now scarce *Hierurgia Anglicana*, or the still scarcer original *Canterburie's Doom*.

INDEX TO VOLUME XVI.

ADLER, Dr. H., on 'Passover Wine,' 219
Æsop's Fables, origin of, 41
Ambrose, S., meaning of his language in regard to the Roman See, 25
Apostolic succession, its significance in regard to the preservation of the Apostolic tradition, 15
Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Benson), on the 'solitariness' and 'isolation' of our Bishops, 171
Arianism, description of, 375 *sqq.*; meaning of Arius' *Thalia*, 378; S. Athanasius' part in the controversy, 378; S. Basil, 389; the Council of Alexandria, 391; the 'Creed of Constantinople,' 398 *sqq.*
A Seaman's Life on board a Man-of-War, 268 *sq.*
Athanasius, S., on Pope Liberius, 24; as the opponent of Arianism, 378, 386, 391
Augustine, S., on the African conception of 'the See of Peter,' 28 *sq.*; his theory of Church unity, 29
Authority in matters of faith, the claims of, 71 *sqq.*; legitimate province of free thought, 74; ancient rivalry between free thought and authority, 75; authority of conscience, 77; claims of Holy Scripture, 78; co-ordinate authority of Scripture and the Church, 85; comprehensiveness of Scripture, 86; the idea of doctrinal development deprecated, 88; the doctrinal statements (*de fide*) of the Church of England, 90; the Church's province to guide opinion, *ib.*; Synods, 94

BABRIUS' Fables, complete collection at Mount Athos, 41
Bachelor, degree of, first conferred upon students of Gratian, 277
'Barlaam and Josaphat, Saints,' the romance of, 41 *sq.*
Barlow, Mr., *The Ultimatum of Pessimism*, 239
Bedford, Bishop of, on our Lord's use of real wine, 227
Bickersteth, Dean, Exposition of S. Mark's Gospel, 467
Bishops, their position in regard to the Ritual question (1865), 192
Blackley, Rev. W. L., on Clergy Pensions, 130
Böhmer, Dr., his edition of the Codex of Gratian, 272 *sq.*
Bright, Dr., on the *mustum* and *in necessitate* of S. Thomas Aquinas, 223 *n.*
Broglie, M. l'Abbé de, *Le Positivisme et la Science Expérimentale*, 247 *sqq.*
Bullock, Rev. C., *A Plea for the Evangelization of the Masses by Voluntary Lay Help*, 339
Bunsen's connexion with Thirlwall, 104
Buriates of Russia, their ingenious device for obtaining a hearing of their sacred books, 43 *n.*

CALLISTUS, Pope, charges of heresy brought against him by S. Hippolytus, 17; his the-

CAN

ology, 19; his laxity in discipline, *ib.*

Canon Law, value of the study of, 270 *sqq.*; the neglect of the study explained, 270; the *Decretum Gratiani*, 271; the codification of laws, Eastern and Western, 274; Britain preferred the Eastern, 275; Pseudo-Isidore forgeries, 275; object of Gratian's work, 277; its divisions, 278; additions made by Popes, 278; gradual reception of the Canon Law over Europe, 279; many of the decretals arose out of English controversies, 280; Canon Law interwoven with English laws, *ib.*; much of our unwritten law has the Canon Law for a basis, 281

'Canons of the Apostles,' 275

Catholic side of Anglicanism, the, 420 *sqq.*; the High Church party in America, 422; mischief wrought by the Evangelical party in England, 423, 426, 429; revival of Church influence in America, 424 *sq.*; the Broad Church School under William III., 428; Mr. Goldwin Smith's indictment of High Anglicanism, 431; its statements criticized, 432 *sqq.*

Cave Browne, Mr. J., *Lambeth Palace and its Associations*, 494

Chambers, Mr. J. D., his translation of the works of Hermes Trismegistus, 230

Cheyne, Rev. T. K., on Jeremiah, 466

Church government in Clement's day, 13; power inherited by the Bishops from the Apostles, *ib.*; basis of ministerial authority, 14

Church Organization in the Royal Navy, 257; chaplains' work on board ship, 258; pastoral visitation of ships in harbour, 259; office of Chaplain-General of the Navy, 260; lack of ecclesiastical control, 261; temperance work, *ib.*; isolation of chaplains, 262; religious work done by officers, 264; a 'flag-chaplain' proposed, 265; work by such men as Bishop Ken (1683), 266; 'harbour chaplains' proposed by Convocation, 267; recent moral improvement in the Navy, 268

EVO

Clergy Pensions, a plan for their institution and working sketched, 130–140; statistical bases of the scheme proposed, 141–151

Confirmations, comparative statistics in regard to, 156 *sqq.*

Contempt of court, the Lord Chancellor's Bill on: the effect of its enactments considered, 203–209

Convocation, Reports on 'Spiritual Provision for Seamen,' 264, 266

Creighton, Rev. M., *A History of the Papacy*, &c., 480

Cyprian, S., formulated the doctrine of Church Unity, 26; on the independence of Bishops, 27

Cyril, S., his alliance with Rome, 25

DAVIES, Rev. G. J., *Papers on Preaching*, 488

Dead Hand (The) in the Free Churches, 243

Deane, Rev. A. M., *The Church and her Curates*, 135, 147

De Fleury, *La Messe*, 497

Deprivation, the penalty of, 205

Devon, Earl of, on Bishops in the House of Lords, 176

Dictates, the, of Pope Gregory VII., 279; one of them declares the Pope impeccable, *ib.*

Dionysius Exiguus, codification of Western canons attributed to, 274

Duruy, Mons. A., *L'Instruction publique et la Révolution*, 489

ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS, the Royal Commission on their constitution, 207

Edersheim, Dr., on 'Passover Wine,' 220

Ellison, Canon, on the 'Scripture Wine Question,' 216

Elwin, Rev. W., *Confession and Absolution in the Bible*, 237

Episcopate and Presbyterate, their original relation, 14

Evolution, Ethics and Religion, 346 *sqq.*; Mr. Leslie Stephen's *Science of Ethics* summarized and reviewed, 347 *sqq.*; no science

FAR

of ethics can be founded on evolution, 349; the historical method fails in the hands of the evolutionist, 350; connexion of morality and religion, 352; operation of Christian ideas, 354; conscience, 355; religion the sanction of morality, 357; the Unknowable, 358; the morality of martyrdom, 360; objection met, 363; the evolutionist cannot influence society, 365; his uncertainty as to the moral usefulness of moral truth, 368; his explanation of 'duty,' 'merit,' 'obligation,' 369; his notion of a virtuous man, 372: of conscience, 373: of moral responsibility, 374; man's moral progress has included religion as a factor, *ib.*

FARRAR, Rev. Dr. F. W., *The Early Days of Christianity* reviewed, 47 *sqq.*; great popularity of the author's works, 49; his style, *ib.*; his teaching, 50; danger of a tendency to vulgarize religion, 51; division of Dr. Farrar's work, 52; S. Paul before Nero, 53; the persecutions of the Christians, 54; the writings of the Apostles and early Christians, 55; the authorship of the 'Hebrews,' 56, 61; S. Peter's connexion with Rome, 59; Alexandrian Christianity, 61; the 'Brethren of the Lord,' 64; the Epistle of S. James, 66; the earlier life and the works of S. John, 67

Folk-Tales, growing interest in, 31; their various character, 32; nursery tales, 34; the comparative method, 35; their vitality, *ib.*; fables common to East and West, 36; Russia a congenial soil for folk-tales, 37; the Baba Yaga, 38, 41; Story of 'Vasilissa the Fair,' 38; position of the stepmother in folk-tales, *ib.*; origin of Æsop's Fables, 41; Tibetan tales collected by Prof. Schiefner, 43; the life-work of Csoma de Körös, 45

Forbin d'Oppède, Marquise de, her

INC

edition of the Duchesse de Liancourt's *Règlement*, 252

Fosbery, Mr., his *Words of Counsel*, &c., cited, 189

Friedberg, Dr., his recension of Richter's *Corpus Juris Canonici*, 272

GAY, Mons. V., *Glossaire archéologique du Moyen Age et de la Renaissance*, 496

Gladstone, Mr., his position in regard to the Ritual movement (1867), 195

Gospel for the Nineteenth Century, The, criticized, 307

Grote's *History of Greece*, Dr. Thirlwall's great admiration for, 120

Gwatkin, Mr., his *Studies of Arianism* reviewed, 375 *sqq.*

HARE, Julius C., his connexion with Thirlwall, 103, 107; the translation of Niebuhr's *History of Rome*, 107; the reply to the *Quarterly* Reviewer, 108

Hawarden, Dr., his question on Arianism to Dr. Clarke, 376 *n*

Hefele, Bishop, his *History of the Councils*, Vol. III., 233

Hermes Trismegistus, his *Poemandres*, 230

Hippolytus, S., his controversy with Pope Callistus, 17; of what see was he Bishop? 19

Holy Communion, use of unfermented wine in the, 210 *sqq.*

Hughes, Mr. T., *The Manliness of Christ* criticized, 300 *sqq.*

Huit, M. l'Abbé, *Platon à l'Académie*, 491

Huther, Dr. J. E., *Handbook to the General Epistles of James and John*, 229; on the ἀδελφοὶ Ἰησοῦ, 229 *sq.*

INCREASE of the episcopate, proposed, 153 *sqq.*; marked deficiencies of the episcopate, 153; number of suffragan Bishops in the olden time, 154; the present plan of holding confirmations criticized, 155; tabulated statistics of population and confirmations, 156 *sqq.*; Sunday confirmations,

164; evening confirmations, 165; benefits of small dioceses, 166; drawbacks of large dioceses, 167; suitable size for a diocese, 168; episcopal incomes, 169; the episcopate in Scotland, 170; bishop and clergy and bishop and people, 171; representative assemblies of the Church, 173; a 'Central Council' advocated, 175; how the deficiencies of the episcopate can best be supplied, 177; suggestions for the increase of suffragan bishops, 178; objections answered, 183

Innocent, Pope, and the African bishops, 23

JEROME, S., estimate of his language about communion with the See of Rome, 25

John Damascene, S., had some knowledge of Indian literature, 42

Josaphat, S., identity of, with Gotama the Buddha, 42; 'Saints Barlaam and Josaphat,' *ib.*

KALILAH and Diminah known to S. John Damascene, 42

Ken, Bishop, work done by him as Chaplain of the Fleet (1683), 264, 266

Körös, Csoma de, story of his heroic devotion to the cause of knowledge, 45

LE COURAYER, PIERRE FRANÇOIS, sketch of his life, 315 *sqq.*; his studies and work on the validity of Anglican Ordinations, 316; correspondence with Archbishop Wake, 317; difficulties in the way of publishing Courayer's work, 318; his assailants in France, 319; condemnation of his work, and captivity of the author, 322; Bishop Atterbury aids his escape, *ib.*; Courayer's warm reception in England, 323; receives a pension from the English Government, 325; translates Sarpi's *History of the Council of Trent*, 326; his character as a man and as a divine, 327; his portrait at Oxford, 328; his death, 330

Langen, Dr. J., *History of the Roman Church*, 11 *sqq.*; the author's qualification for his work, 11; the foundation and development of the Roman Church, 12; the succession of Bishops at Rome, 13; relation of the Episcopate and the Presbyterate, 14; action of heretics towards Rome, 15; first instance of 'Roman aggression,' 17; S. Hippolytus and Pope Callistus, 18; literary remains of the Church of Rome, 21; epoch of Damasus and Siricius, 22; claims of Pope Innocent, 23; S. Athanasius and Pope Liberius, 24; position of Council of Ephesus towards Rome, 25; the great Western and African teachers, 25; union with 'the See of Peter,' 27

Lardner, Dr. Dionysius, Thirlwall's connexion with, 119

Lay Work in the Royal Navy, essay on, 260, 264

Lear, Mrs. H. L. S., *Five Minutes' Daily Reading of Poetry*, 498

Lee, Rev. M. H., *Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry*, 486

Liancourt, Jeanne Duchesse de, sketch of her life, 252

Lincoln, Bishop of, on the wine of Holy Communion, 227

Littledale, Dr., on 'Passover Wine,' 220; on the Armenian use of the unmixed chalice, 222 *n.*

London Lay Helpers' Association, the work of the, 332 *sqq.*; the layman's position as to Church work, 333; the spiritual condition of London, 333; foundation and object of the Association, 334; its constitution and membership, *ib.*; 'Mission Readers,' 336; Readers for the navy desiderated, *ib.*; means of intellectual and spiritual improvement for the Associates: at Oxford, *ib.*; at S. Paul's Cathedral, 337; benefits to be hoped for from development in other dioceses, 338; some drawbacks noticed, 341;

LON

Readers and Mission Chapels, 342; clerical supervision of Readers' work, 344; similar work elsewhere, 345
Longley, Archbishop, on the Ritual question (1865), 190 *sq.*
Lumby, Rev. J. R., *A Popular Introduction to the New Testament*, 472
Lünemann, Dr. G., *Handbook to the Epistle to the Hebrews*, 229

MALAN, Rev. S. C., on 'the fruit of the vine,' 221
Malleson, Rev. P. A., his *Jesus Christ: His Life and Work*, criticized, 303
Ménard, Mons. A. L., *Œuvres inédites de Bossuet*, 246
'Missions to Seamen' Society, 266
Mozley, Rev. J. B., *Lectures and other Theological Papers*, 473
Müller, Prof., *India: What can it Teach us?* 485
Muratori, Canon of, 14
Myriantheus, Archimandrite H., on the use of wine in the Holy Eucharist, 222

NARDI, Mgr., on the *Decretum Gratiani*, 273, 277
Naval Church Society, its volume of essays on *Church Organization in the Royal Navy*, 264
New Books, &c., 256, 501
Newman, Cardinal, his *Arians of the Fourth Century* appraised, 380
Nicæa, Council of, Roman interpolations in its canons, 23
Nomenclature of English Dissent, the, 402 *sqq.*; Nonconformists were not Separatists, 403; the 'Episcopal Nonconformists,' 'Presbyterian Puritans,' &c., 404; Nonconformists deemed themselves members of the Church of England, 406; they boasted that they were anti-Separatists, 409; points of affinity between Nonconformity and Separatism, 415

OFFICIAL Year-Book of the Church of England, 254
Our duty on the Marriage Question, 463 *sqq.*

ROC

Our Lord's Human Example, 282 *sqq.*; the modern method of dealing with Christ, 283; power of example on the natural basis, 284; the appeal to Christ's example, 286; the Church's conception of Christ's Person, 288; His impeccability, 289; misconceptions to be guarded against, 290; Christ's incarnate life in relation to the ministry of the Spirit, 292; the aim of the Incarnation, *ib.*; universality of Christ's human nature, 294; the immanence of Christ in His Church, 295; the doctrine of the 'Second Adam,' 296; Christ the immanent Source of redemptive life, 297; Nestorian and Pelagian views, 298; S. Augustine's controversy with Julian on Christ's sinlessness, 298, 306; William Law on Christ Incarnate, 299; recent books on Our Lord criticized by the standard of the Church's teaching, 300; Dr. Farrar and M. de Pressensé on Christ's peccability, 304

PALEÆ (Canon Law), meaning of the term, 272 *n*
Palgrave, Mr. F. T., *The Visions of England*, 1; criticism of the verse and style, 1 *sqq.*; his estimate of the Tudors, &c., 4 *sqq.*
Phædrus' Fables, some of them are of Buddhist origin, 41
Planudes, the fables collected by, 41; whence he gathered them, *ib.*; Buddhist origin of some of them, *ib.*

RALSTON, Mr., *Russian Folk-Tales* and *Tibetan Tales*, 31 *sqq.*
Renaudot, on the alleged use of 'grape juice' in the Holy Eucharist, 222 *n.*; on 'English Ordinations,' 316
Richter, Dr., his edition of the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, 273
Robertson, Mr. A., *S. Athanasius on the Incarnation*, 479
Rochester, Bishop of, on the use of wine, 217

RUL

Rule, Mr., *Life and Times of S. Anselm*, 476

SALMON, Dr., 'Chronology of Hippolytus,' 60
Schaff, Dr., *Religious Encyclopædia*, 232
Schiefner, Prof., *Tibetan Tales*, 43
Seymour, Mr. E., *Christchurch Cathedral, Dublin*, 495
Sixth Book of Decretals, 278
Smeaton, Dr. G., *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*, 235
Smith, Dr. W., *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, 234
Souvenirs d'Enfance et de Jeunesse, M. Renan's, 444 *sqq.*: character of the book, 445; account of his 'Sulpician virtues,' 446; life in Brittany, 449; his early life, 450; morals of the French clergy, 451; M. Dupanloup, 452; Renan's life at S. Nicolas de Chardonnet, 453; at S. Sulpice, 455; the teachers there, 457; his Oriental studies, 460; refuses to take orders, 461; takes to secular work, 461
Spencer, Mr. H., *First Principles*, 359, 364
Stephen, Mr. Leslie, his *Science of Ethics* criticised, 346 *sqq.*

TASMANIA, Bishop of, on Synods of clergy and laity in the Colonial churches, 176
Temperance Work in the Navy, 261
Theologische Literaturzeitung, 500
Thirlwall, Bishop, 95 *sqq.*; his precocity as a child, 97; at the Charterhouse, 101; at Trinity College, Cambridge, 102; visit to Rome: connexion with Bunsen, 104; a law-student at Lincoln's Inn, 106; his translation of Niebuhr's *History of Rome*, 108; assistant-tutor at Cambridge, 109; controversy on the admission of Dissenters to degrees, *ib.*; his *History of Greece*, 119; his admiration for Grote's kindred work, 120; his life as

WOO

Bishop of S. David's, 122; his fund for the augmentation of small livings, 124; relations with his brother Bishops, 127; his opinions as a Churchman, 128
Thomson, Rev. Prof., Homiletics on S. Mark's Gospel, 467
Tracy, Mr. C. H., on the difficulties of naval chaplains, 261
Trevor, Rev. W., his clerical life-insurance scheme, 131

ULLATHORNE, Bishop, on the wine of the Eucharist, 223; on the alleged use of milk in place of wine, 224
Unfermented Wine in Holy Communion, the use of, 210 *sqq.*; the statements of Dr. Norman Kerr in *Passover Wine* criticized, 212; the wines of Scripture, 213; dietetic value of alcohol, 214; reply to objections, 215; the wine mentioned in the New Testament was fermented and intoxicating, 218; Dr. H. Adler and others on 'Passover Wine,' 219; Church usage, 221; the Orientals, 222; the Roman Church, 223 *sq.*; chemical definition of wine, 224; the 'appeal on behalf of reformed inebriates,' 225

WAKE, Archbishop, his correspondence with Du Pin and Girardin, 313; exhortations to French clergy, 315
Weiss, Dr., *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*, 469
Wilberforce, Bishop, latter years of, 185 *sqq.*; his connexion with the Ritual movement, 187; the *Use and Misuse of Symbols*, 189; the Ritual Commission, 189, 197; his Charge on the Ritual question (1867), 194; the Bill proposed by Lord Shaftesbury, 195; Reports of the Ritual Commission, 197, 199; the last Report (on revised rubrics, &c.), 201
Wood, Rev. Preb., *Church Finance*, 139, 152

Spottiswoode & Co., Printers, New-street Square, London.



222.57